



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

APPENDIX.



- I. PROCEEDINGS OF TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL SESSION,
EASTON, PA., 1889.
- II. TREASURER'S REPORT (p. iv).
- III. LIST OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS (p. xlix).
- IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION (p. lxi).
- V. PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION (p. lxiii).
- VI. INDICES TO VOLS. I-XX.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE TWENTY-FIRST
ANNUAL SESSION (EASTON).

Herbert L. Baker, Detroit, Mich.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
P. M. Biklé, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
Edward B. Clapp, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
Manuel J. Drennan, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
A. Gudeman, New York, N. Y.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, New York, N. Y.
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Edward W. Hopkins, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Theodore W. Hunt, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
George B. Hussey, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
John B. Kieffer, Lancaster, Pa.
Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Francis A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Samuel A. Martin, Lincoln University, Pa.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
James M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Edward E. Phillips, Marietta College, Marietta, O.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Sylvester Primer, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.
Julius Sachs, New York, N. Y.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
C. P. G. Scott, New York, N. Y.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
William D. Shipman, Buchtel College, Akron, O.
M. S. Slaughter, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.
Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Edward Snyder, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
J. R. S. Sterrett, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Morris H. Stratton, Salem, N. J.
Andrew F. West, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

[Total, 38.]

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

EASTON, PA., Tuesday, July 9, 1889.

THE Twenty-First Annual Session was called to order at 4 P.M., in Room 5, Pardee Hall, Lafayette College, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn., President of the Association.

The Secretary, Professor John H. Wright, presented the following report of the Executive Committee : —

a. The Committee had elected as members of the Association :¹ —

Charles W. Bain, Portsmouth, Va.
Herbert L. Baker, Detroit, Mich.
Charles W. Ballard, New York, N. Y.
P. M. Biklé, Professor in Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
Edward Capps, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
James C. Egbert, Instructor in Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Edwin W. Fay, Fellow of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Abraham L. Fuller, Instructor in Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
George P. Garrison, Professor of English, Austin, Tex.
A. Gudeman, Ph. D., New York, N. Y.
J. Leslie Hall, Professor of English, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.
Benjamin F. Harding, Belmont School, Cambridge, Mass.
Lawrence C. Hull, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
John B. Kieffer, Professor in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
Charles Sigourney Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
Clifford H. Moore, Oakland, Cal.
Charles A. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Ransom Norton, Houlton, Me.
Rev. Endicott Peabody, Groton School, Groton, Mass.
Edwin M. Pickop, High School, Hartford, Conn.
George Rodeman, Ph. D., Cambridge, Mass.
T. F. Sanford, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Henry A. Scribner, Plainfield, N. J.
Albert H. Smyth, Philadelphia, Pa.

¹ In this list are included the names of all persons elected to membership at the Twenty-First Annual Session of the Association. The addresses given are, as far as can be, those of the autumn of 1889.

F. C. Sumichrast, Assistant Professor of French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Fitz Gerald Tisdall, Professor of Greek, College of the City of New York, N. Y.

H. C. Tolman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

J. W. H. Walden, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Hamilton Wallace, Principal Public High School, Tulare, Cal.

Sarah E. Wright, Augusta Seminary, Staunton, Va.

A. C. Zenos, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

b. The Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Session (Amherst) were to be issued in the course of the meeting; the Transactions for the same year (Vol. XIX.) would be issued in a few weeks.

c. The Committee had voted to give copies of the Transactions of the Association to the Smithsonian Institution and to the American School of Athens, as well as to the institutions named on pp. 1, li., of the Proceedings for 1888.

Professor Wright presented also his report as Treasurer of the Association for the year ending July 6, 1889. The summary of accounts for 1888-89 is as follows:—

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand, July 7, 1888	\$487.19
Fees, assessments, and arrears paid in	\$918.25
Sales of Transactions and of Reprints	216.59
Total receipts for the year	1134.84
	<hr/> \$1622.03

EXPENDITURES.

For Transactions (Vol. XVIII.) and Proceedings for 1887:	
composition, printing, distribution	\$760.41
For postages, stationary, job printing, clerk hire	75.00
Interest on borrowed money (\$200) with partial payment (\$12.20 + \$50)	62.20
Total expenditures for the year	\$897.61
Balance on hand, July 6, 1889	724.42
	<hr/> \$1622.03

The Association owes the Treasurer \$200, the debt of \$250 of July 7, 1889, having been reduced by the payment of \$50, Nov. 1, 1888.

The Chair appointed as Committee to audit the Treasurer's report, Messrs. Isaac H. Hall and H. W. Smyth.

At 4.20 P.M. the reading of papers was begun. At this time there were about thirty persons present; at the subsequent meetings the number averaged forty-five.

1. Notes on Andocides, by Professor W. S. Scarborough, of Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.

The Mss. and editions of Andocides now extant are the same as those of the orator Antiphon with the omission of the Oxford (N) which makes no mention of this orator. Or as Blass¹ puts it:—

“Andocidis codices eosdem fere atque Antiphontis habemus praeterquam quod Oxoniensis N ope in hoc oratore destituti sumus.”

Both of these orators have come down to us together, and the defects and corruptions which they have in common indicate that they are derived from a common archetype. The bibliographical observations made in respect to the one are almost equally applicable to the other.

It is generally conceded that the Crippsianus (A) is the most accurate, and therefore the best Ms. that we have of Andocides. Bekker used this as the basis of his text. He also collated the Laurentian (B), the Marcian (L), and a Breslau copy. Then he further examined the Ambrosian (P) and the Burneian (M). As to the Ambrosian (Q) and in respect to its bearing upon the Andocidean orations, vide Blass, etc. (Teubner). Baiter, Bekker, Blass, and Sauppe have, perhaps, given us the best texts; while Meier, Hirschigg, Kirchoff, Vater, Stephen, Reiske, Dobson, Sluiter, Dobree, Valckenaer, Bergk, Klotz, Maetzner, and others have thrown much light upon various points in the text.

Immanuel Bekker has done especial service to scholars by his remarkably clear and complete recension of the Andocidean orations. Aldus gave us the first complete edition, though full of errors. Bekker, Dobree, and Schiller followed with others in emending and correcting the Aldine edition. The Zurich edition was represented by Baiter and Sauppe who were not less vigilant than others of their contemporaries in their efforts to furnish a faultless text. I regard the edition of Blass the most available text that we have. It is certainly one of the best recensions of that orator to be found in the libraries of Europe, aside perhaps from a few orthographical forms observed here and there, which are probably foreign to the age of Andocides. Blass uses σφίζω with ι subscript and defends it with the remark: “Scribere dum esse in vulgus notum est contra ἐσώθην σωτηρία.” Curtius, in his *Das Verbum der Griechischen Sprache* seinem Baue nach dargestellt, discusses with numerous examples the two forms σφίζω, σώζω, and seems to favor the latter. In the *Etymologicum Magnum* I observe the following: “Ἄλλ’ ἢ παράδοσις ἔχει τὸ ι. τὸ δὲ σφίζω, ὅτε μὲν γίνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶος σσιζω ὡς λέπος λεπίζω καὶ κατὰ συναίρεσιν σφίζω ἔχει τὸ ι. ἡνίκα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ σῶος σσῶζω καὶ κρᾶσει σώζω, οὐκ ἔχει προσγεγραμμένον τὸ ι (p. 741. 25).—That is to say that σώζω has the ι subscript when derived from σῶος and that σσιζω becomes by synæresis (συναίρεσις) σφίζω, just as λεπίζω is from λέπος; further, that σσῶζω is derived from σῶος and does not take the iota, but becomes by crasis (κρᾶσις) σώζω. Neither this nor the explanation of Buttman² is conclusive, though the appearance of the ι subscript form is fully established by Attic inscriptions of an early date—and yet I am of the opinion that σώζω is more classic than σφίζω. Dr. Smyth, however, calls my attention to the fact that σώζω does not appear upon Attic inscriptions till after 100 B.C.

¹ Preface to his Ed. (Teubner), p. iii.

² Ausführliche Griechische Sprachlehre, II. 295.

The style of Andocides is peculiar. Aside from the frequent repetition of the same thought there is a loose connection of sentences; the tendency to change abruptly his construction, by the introduction of new clauses and then to resume his narrative with δὲ οὗτος, or οὗτος δὲ (vide Myst. I, 2, 27, 56, 57, 58, 59, 70-73, 80-81, 137-139, 140-145, etc., etc.; De Red. 3, etc.; De Pace 5, 34, etc., etc.) Blass, in his edition, uses εἵνεκα for ἔνεκα. εἵνεκα is a form not generally found in the tragic poets, nor in the best Attic prose, though it occurs in Plato, also in Demosthenes, and in the Antiphonic Tetral., B, β, 10. Wecklein and Weil admit the form in their editions of Æschylus, vide Wackernagel, K. Z. XXVIII, 109 ff. It is not allowable in the tragic poets, nor is it admissible in the best Attic prose. Between μὴ θέλοντας and μὴ ἰθέλοντας, Greek usage compels us to adopt the shorter form, though Baiter and Sauppe write the longer. "ἐθέλω is found upon all Attic inscriptions till the year 300 B.C.; after 200 B.C. θέλω comes to light." — Blass has bracketed the dative after κελεύω (vide Myst. 11). A similar construction appears in § 40 (Myst.). The dative is never thus used in the best Attic prose. — Again I note the use of an enclitic form of the pronoun after the preposition, as in the phrase πρὸς με (λέγει πρὸς με Χαρμίδης). This is certainly contrary to the general rule as the following examples will show: ἐπ' ἐμοί, Xen. Oecon. VII. 14; κατ' ἐμέ, Id. II. 9; παρ' ἐμοί, Id. XI. 9; περὶ ἐμοῦ, Id. II. 15; ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, Id. VII. 3. For other examples, vide Dem. Cor., Hdt., etc. — In the phrase τότε δὴ προσιὼν Λυσίστρατον we have an unusual example of a *personal object* after προσιέναι. Cf. Xen. Mem. I. 2, 47.

Another queer construction is found in the use of τοῦτον τῷ τρόπῳ for τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον — the dative for the modal acc.; vide Aristoph., Plato, etc. There are many other debatable forms found in some of the editions of the Andocidean orations — some interpolations, others a part of the original narrative. Andocides was largely inclined to the use of circumlocutions and ambiguities, and there is need of caution on the part of critics in their attempt to separate the genuine from the spurious. As to the Κατ' Ἀλκιβιάδου, whether Andocides was the author or not, there is much discussion. Yet the similarity of style, the numerous periods ending in anacolutha, etc., etc., aside from the historical inaccuracies, would indicate that he was the author of the oration against Alcibiades.

Remarks were made by Messrs. E. W. Hopkins, T. D. Seymour, J. H. Wright, and H. W. Smyth.

2. Maximus Planudes: his Life and Works, by Dr. A. Gudeman, of New York, N.Y.

The all but universally accepted verdict of condemnation which has been passed upon Byzantine scholarship, however just it may be found to have been in numerous instances, has undoubtedly been the chief cause of blinding the eyes of philologists to the distinguished merits of at least one of the scholars of that time, the monk Maximus Planudes. This verdict reached, as it demonstrably was, upon altogether insufficient evidence and upon sweeping generalizations, due in a great measure, to a lack of historical perspective, naturally not only precluded any accurate criticism, but decidedly discouraged renewed impartial investigations.

The ambitious aim of this paper, of which the following is but a very short abstract,¹ is to replace traditional prejudices and errors by facts; to give an accurate and detailed account of Planudes' life, and by a complete critical survey of his writings, to pave the way for a juster appreciation of this monk's services to classical philology.

Right at the very outset of our inquiry, we must enter upon a detailed discussion of the traditional data in Planudes' life which, though singularly erroneous, have nevertheless been accepted, without question, as true, for the last three hundred years; his ἀκμή being generally assigned to the year 1353 (I know not on what grounds), and the date of his diplomatic mission to Venice to the year 1327. The original source of this piece of chronological information seems to have been *Raphael Maffeus Volaterra's* (1451-1521) *Commentarii Urbani*, lib. XVII.² The data just given subsequently passed into Lambecius' Catalogue of the library of Vienna and into Fabricius' famous *Bibliotheca Graeca*, and from this time on were never called into question, until in 1877 Maximilian Treu conclusively proved them wrong.³ But Treu's discovery remaining practically unknown, whether we ascribe this fact to the strange vitality so characteristic of error, or to the inaccessibility of his little pamphlet, the author of this paper thought himself justified in again taking up Treu's convincing arguments in his thesis,⁴ adding such corroborative evidence as the then still unpublished letters of Planudes happily supplied him with.⁵

This short abstract will, of course, not admit of more than the very briefest review of the arguments, by which the traditional chronology has been shown to be altogether untenable.

There is an epigram extant (p. 65, of my dissertation) composed by one *Gregorius*.⁶ It consists of twenty-two rather uncouth hexameter and pentameter verses, and deeply deplores the death of Maximus Planudes, as an irretrievable loss to his country. His works, some of which the writer enumerates, are pronounced to be of so great a value, as to entitle their lamented author to a glorious immortality. The "poem" does not add anything to our previous knowledge of Planudes, with the very important exception of the seventh line, which reads as follows:—

Πέμπτῃν ἑξαγώνων ἑτέων δεκάδ' ἔσθ' ἄκρα μούσης

We are here told, on the unimpeachable testimony of an intimate friend, that Planudes did not much exceed the age of fifty. With this fact we combine another.

¹ The entire paper will be published in the *American Journal of Philology*.

² It is true, Volaterra asks his readers to consult Bessarion for the data given by him. I have, however, been unable to find the slightest trace of the statement referred to in the published works of the famous cardinal, although he speaks of Planudes repeatedly.

³ Cf. M. Treu *Gymnasial Prog.* Waldenburg, i/Schl. 1877 ("Zu Plutarch's *Moralia*").

⁴ A. Gudeman *De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo*, Berolini, 1888, Calvary & Co. (p. 67 sqq.).

⁵ The letters, one hundred and twenty-two in number, have now been published by Treu in successive programmes of the Friedrichs Gymnasium of Breslau; cf. especially the programme of 1889, p. 183 sqq.

⁶ Perhaps identical with the friend addressed in Planudes' 25, 26, and 27 letters.

There is preserved in the library of Venice a manuscript in Planudes' own handwriting, containing the Gospel of St. John, from the subscription of which we learn of its being completed in September, 1302. Now assuming the traditional chronology which assigns his *floruit* to the year 1353 to be correct, Planudes must have been about two years old at the time, when he finished the copy of the Gospel of St. John, an example of precocity, surely as unprecedented as it is absurd!

Nor does the year 1327, given as the date of the embassy, fare any better, for it can be conclusively proven from a passage in Pachymeres and from Planudes' own correspondence (cf. p. 69 sqq. of my dissertation) that he left for Venice in the company of Leon Orphanotrophos in the winter of 1296, being then, to use Pachymeres' own words, an *ἄνθρωπος ἐλλόγιμος καὶ συνετός*. Combining all these facts, we arrive at the following chronological data: Planudes was born about 1250-1260, and was sent as an ambassador to the Venetian Republic in 1296. He copied the Gospel of St. John in *September*, 1302, and having not much exceeded the age of fifty, he cannot well have died later than 1310, though possibly earlier.

Planudes was born in Nicomedia, as he tells us himself in the prooemium to his "Encomium in sanctum megalomartyrem Diomedem."¹ He left his native town at an early age for Constantinople, for in Ep. 112, 40, he describes a triumphal procession,² commemorating a great victory over the Persians which occurred in 1282. On taking orders, he discarded his baptismal name Manuel for that of Maximus.³ He soon became involved in the ecclesiastical controversies between the Greek and Latin churches, concerning the momentous question of the emanation of the Holy Ghost, and it was in support of the shrewd ecclesiastical policy of Michael Palaeologus that he probably translated St. Augustin's De trinitate, but on the accession to the throne of Andronicus II., who completely reversed his father's policy, Planudes returned to the orthodox Greek faith, whether on compulsion or not is not clear, by writing four syllogisms (still extant), "de processione Spiriti Sancti contra Latinos." His correspondence shows him to have been on intimate terms with the emperor himself as well as with most of the highest officials of the empire. Omitting minor biographical details, I proceed to enumerate some of the more important of Planudes' works,⁴ having to content myself in this place with a mere skeleton outline of the subjects treated of.

1. *Anthologia Planudea*.

Its critical value. To be judged solely by the standard of scholarship of the period.

2. *Ms. copy of the works of Plutarch*. Cf. Ep. 106.

"Ἐμὼ δ' ἔδοξε τὰ τοῦ Πλουτάρχου γράψαι βιβλία· πανύ γὰρ οἶσθα τὸν ἄνδρα φιλῶ· δεῖ τοίνυν ἔχειν μεμβράνας."

¹ Cf. Boissonade ad Ovidii Metam., pag. XII. and Treu l.c. (1889), p. 191.

² "ὃν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐδεξάμην, περιφανέστατον τῶν πώποτε ἑδομένων θριάμβων." This letter, together with about twenty-six others, is addressed to the famous General Philanthropenus.

³ On this custom, cf. Treu, l.c. p. 189. The forty-seven verses composed by him "In laudem Ptolomaei" must therefore have been written prior to this time, for the twenty-seventh line reads as follows: ὅς ῥα Μαγνουήλ οὖνομ' ἔχων λέγομ' ἦδ' Πλαγούδης.

⁴ Planudes' theological works were not discussed in this paper.

3. *Life of Aesop* attributed to Planudes. Cf. Bentley Dissert. on Epist. of Phalaris, etc., p. 578 W.
Proof of its spuriousness, from its matter and its style.
4. *Rhetorical and grammatical treatises.*
Especially the Prolegomena to Hermogenes (Rhet. Gr. vol. 5. W.). Their value. Compared to other works of a similar nature.
5. *His mathematical treatises.*
The *Ψηφοφροια κατ' Ἴνδους*, etc. Planudes' services to mathematics hitherto overlooked. An attempt to do him justice. Cf. Ep. 35, 46, 67, 100 sqq. *et saepius*.
6. *His correspondence* (122 Epistles — not edited by himself. Earliest, written about 1282; latest, 1299 (1300?). His personal character.
7. *Translations of Latin into Greek.*
A review of Greek translations from Latin authors before Planudes (Zenobius' Sallust [cf. Suidas], Capito's and Paeanius' Eutropius). Reasons why the Greeks so seldom translated Latin authors into their own tongue. Planudes, the first to do this to any extent, thus opening a new field in Greek literature. The originality and importance of this step hitherto not recognized.
- a. *Boethii De consolatione philosophiae.*
Planudes' masterpiece. Proof that it was written before 1295.
- b. *Caesaris de Bello Gallico, VII books.*
Next in order of merit. Its value for purposes of text criticism. Formerly attributed to Theodorus Gaza, together with the Somnium Scipionis. A conjecture concerning the possible cause of these works being attributed to Gaza.
- c. *Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis.*
The Saturnalia of Macrobius not translated by Planudes. Error of Bentley, Fabricius, etc.
- d. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, lib. III. (de memoria).
- e. *Disticha Catonis.*
Probably his earliest effort as a translator. Compared with Scaliger's Greek version of the same.
- f. *Metamorphoses of Ovid.*
A work of no critical value, but one involving much time and labor.
- h. *Heroides of Ovid.*
Its great critical value. Cf. A. Gudeman, De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo, 1888, Calvary & Co., Berlin (90 pp.).
- i. *Translations falsely attributed to Planudes.*
Boethii De dialectis, Boethii Commentaria in Topica Ciceronis, Augustinus De civitate dei, etc.
8. *Works known to have been written by Planudes, though no longer extant*, Περὶ μουσικῆς (cf. Ep. 64, 25) and others.
9. *Excerpta Dionis, Comparatio hiemis et veris, Medical treatises, etc.*

Scientific character of Planudes. Great learning, indefatigable industry, astounding versatility, and an undying devotion to classical studies. Not an original thinker. His scholarship compared with that of his contemporaries of a superior kind.

The paper closes with a plea for the reversal of the unfavorable judgment which scholars have so long and so unanimously passed upon the life-work of this diligent and learned Byzantine monk.

The Chair appointed as Committee to Nominate Officers for 1889-90, Messrs. I. T. Beckwith, L. H. Elwell, and E. W. Hopkins.

The Committee to propose Time and Place for the next meeting was also appointed: Messrs. T. Peck, J. Sachs, and J. M. Paton.

At 6 P.M. the Association adjourned to meet at 8 o'clock.

EASTON, PA., July 9, 1889.

EVENING SESSION.

The Association with many residents of Easton assembled in the Auditorium of Pardee Hall at 8 P.M.

The programme of papers for the remainder of the session, as arranged by the Executive Committee, was then read by the Secretary.

Rev. James H. Mason Knox, President of Lafayette College, welcomed the Association to Easton in an appropriate address.

The audience then listened to the annual address of the President of the Association.

3. Philological Study in America, by Professor Thomas D. Seymour, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

After congratulating the Association on the auspicious opening of its twenty-first annual meeting, and mentioning briefly the names and services of the prominent philologists who have died during the past year, the speaker gave a survey of the work of the Association and of the course and development of philological study in this country.

This Association has amply justified its existence. The value of its work is not to be measured by its volumes of Transactions and Proceedings, nor by the formal discussions at its meetings. Not a few new and true philological principles have been enunciated and explained before this body. Excellent philological work has been stimulated by the audience which this Association offers. But, after all, the main service of the society is that which the name *Association* implies. Few have departed from these gatherings without the impulse to broader and deeper research. No other science is so far removed as philology from the work and thought of the ordinary man. No other men of science have so much need as ourselves of association and union.

This Association was founded on a comprehensive plan, and some of its difficulties and dangers have arisen from its comprehensiveness. Its founders hoped that it could be divided into sections, and seven different departments were named, but the numbers actually present at its meetings have not justified such a division.

The true Alexandrine idea of philology was adopted at the first,—embracing literary criticism and archaeological illustration, as well as linguistic science. The Association includes also paedagogy in the broadest sense, though not in technicalities. The condition of philological study in this country requires that most of us should direct our efforts to the presentation of philological facts and principles to our classes quite as much as to the discovery of new philological truths. The first duty of most is to teach well,—*i.e.* to know their subject, and to set it forth in an accurate, intelligible, attractive, and impressive form, avoiding unnecessary matter and insoluble problems. But the second commandment, which is like unto the first, is to pursue philological study for its own sake. It is a blessing to our science in America that the few who are most conspicuous for their attainments and discoveries, are also conspicuous for their paedagogical skill, and are brilliant examples to the rest of us.

The course of philology in America has changed greatly during these last twenty years. When this Association was founded, Professor Whitney was almost alone in delving in the mine of Sanscrit, Professor March and Professor Child had few companions in their work in English philology, the security from control of our leader in the study of the Indian languages was almost a common jest, the very idea of a comparative Semitic Philology was hardly formed, while the Teutonic and Romance Philologies were seeking for recognition.

Twenty years ago, the tendency of philology in America was distinctly towards linguistics. The pendulum swung too far, perhaps, in that direction. The present tendency seems possibly too far away from linguistics, and toward art and archaeology. The same change is seen in the classical instruction of our country. Less attention is paid to the analysis of words, and their relation as cognate or derived. Far more is taught of ancient life and culture. The results of recent archaeological study are presented to our classes. Some of us, indeed, seem in imminent danger of making Greek philology a branch of political science. Etymology and linguistics at one time threatened to claim the sole right to the name of philology, but now a large proportion of classical philologists are turning to the study of inscriptions, vases, and sculpture, as illustrative of ancient life and literature. A multitude of hidden facts will be drawn from the literature itself. This is all well. The study of classical philology must be made as interesting and animated as possible, and the connection of our own life and civilization with that of the ancient Greeks and Romans is so close as to make the acquaintance with this at first hand of high value to every educated man. But classical philology must not become classical archaeology.

If any one desires comfort for the present, and encouragement for the future, of philological study in this country, let him survey the progress of this science in America during the past century. Philology is not an old science here. Our forefathers were too busy in founding a free nation to give much room to literature and art, whether of their own or ancient times. For the first century and more of her existence, Harvard College required for admission no knowledge of Greek beyond the inflexion of nouns and verbs, and in 1800 only about as much Greek was read in college as is now read in the best "fitting-schools." No Greek but the New Testament seems to have been studied in the regular course at Yale College until after the beginning of the nineteenth century. Latin studies were in a somewhat better plight than Greek, since Latin was the scholastic language. The text-books

used in the study of the classics were weak and barren, affording little help to the beginner and none to the more advanced student. The best college libraries had no decent collection of even the classical texts. The Yale library had long possessed a copy of Stephens's Greek Thesaurus (as the gift of Sir Isaac Newton), and copies of the works of Plato and the Platonists (as the gift of Bishop Berkeley), but in 1800 had no copy of Aeschylus and no Greek orators but Demosthenes and Aeschines. Very few even of the old "variorum" editions seem to have found their way to this country in the eighteenth century. The first great change in the teaching of languages at Yale College was due to the election in 1805 of James Luce Kingsley to the chair of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. (As if the duties of this office were insufficient, Professor Kingsley gave instruction also in Church History.) Mr. Kingsley was not a great scholar according to modern standards, but he was an elegant latinist with a strong and keen linguistic sense, and soon broadened the classical course.

Just before 1820, three young Americans whose names are very familiar in other connections, studied philology in Germany, — Edward Everett, George Ticknor, and George Bancroft. Of these, two were drawn aside into political and historical studies, while Ticknor devoted himself to Spanish literature. Everett gave little instruction and seems to have had slight influence on Greek study, except what was due to his translation of Buttman's smaller grammar, and his edition of Jacobs' Greek Reader. Bancroft translated Heeren's *Researches on Ancient Greece*.

Only three or four years after the return of Everett, Ticknor, and Bancroft, Theodore Dwight Woolsey went to Europe and spent three years in the study of Greek. On his return, he was elected to the chair of Greek in Yale College, and entered upon the duties of his professorship in 1831. For twenty years (including the first five of his presidency of the college) he devoted the powers of his great mind to the service of philology. He soon broadened and deepened the course of Greek instruction at Yale and exerted a strong influence on classical teaching elsewhere. His influence has been fitly compared to that of Erasmus at Rotterdam. The editions of Greek works which he prepared and modestly designated as "for the use of American colleges," were admirable when compared with similar English, French, or German editions of that time, and opened a new field for American scholarship.

Certainly, during the first half of this century, no one else was so clearly the leader of philological study in this country as Woolsey, whose mortal remains were laid to rest only four days ago. He secured the best classical library in America, and was thoroughly possessed of the best English and German methods of his time. His mind was thoroughly scientific by nature, besides being acute and virile. If he too had not been drawn away from philology in the strength of his manhood, we may be sure that the world would know Woolsey as a philologist, as it now knows him as an administrator and publicist.

During the lifetime of this Association, the growing importance of the younger departments of our science has secured for them an honored place where they existed before only by sufferance or as ornamental studies. The advance of the old natural sciences, on the other hand, and the development of others of which nothing was known a few years ago, have crowded hard upon the traditional studies of our colleges. But in our larger institutions, many studies are now made optional

or elective, and a student who desires to pursue philological courses can give more time to this pursuit, and can make considerable attainments while still an undergraduate. This has led philological teachers to offer more advanced courses and a larger variety. Dozens do now what only a remarkable individual here and there attempted thirty years ago.

Simply to register the most important philological books of the last twenty years would be a considerable task. The student of to-day would feel helpless without the works of these last years.

In our own land, besides the yearly volume of Transactions of this Association, our sister association publishes Modern Language Notes, the American Journal of Philology has reached its tenth volume, and the American Journal of Archaeology its fifth volume; Hebraica represents with credit and energy Semitic Studies; the Classical Review has been introduced into the midst of us; the Universities of Cornell, Nebraska, and Texas (the oldest of which is hardly older than this Association) have published valuable Philological Studies; the American Institute of Archaeology has published accounts of its explorations in Mexico and its excavations in Asia Minor; while the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (may we call it the *filia pulchrior* of the Institute of Archaeology?) has published four volumes of Papers.

No one here would think or allow that any branch of philology is effete; that its growth is checked and its powers exhausted; that only a scanty gleanings of facts and principles remains for us and our successors. We all feel that the fresh strength of any department of our science is sure to bring new vigor to all the rest. The tie which binds us is stronger than it seems. We have much in common, and we all may profit by union. Let us trust that the growth of the future will be as rapid and as sound as that of the past, and that we may always find a rallying point for learning and for free discussion in the meetings of this Association.

At the close of the address, the Association adjourned to 9 A.M. Wednesday.

EASTON, PA., July 10, 1889.

The Association was called to order at 9.15 A.M. by Professor T. D. Seymour, the President.

The Association was invited, on behalf of the Committee on Entertainment, to make at 3.30 P.M. an excursion to Paxinosa Inn, where dinner would be served and a reception held in the evening.

The invitation was accepted, and it was determined to adjourn at 12 M. and to hold a second session from 1.30 P.M. to 3.30 P.M.

The reading of communications was then resumed.

4. The Meter of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, by Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

The first book of *Paradise Lost* is perhaps the most perfect production of metrical art. A complete digest of its meter will give a good idea of Milton's blank verse.

Each verse is made up of five feet of equal times. It is also made up of two or more great divisions or sections. Milton himself lays stress, as a part of musical delight, upon having "the sense variously drawn out from one verse into another," i.e. on the management of the verse caesura.

He has seven familiar places for the caesura: after each foot but the last, and in the midl of the second, third, and fourth. Two often occur in the same verse. In the whole book their number is as follows: —

First foot.		Second foot.		Third foot.		Fourth foot.		Fifth foot.
Midl.	End.	Midl.	End.	Midl.	End.	Midl.	End.	Midl.
4	35	77	161	166	196	108	33	5

It is by tracing the movement of the caesura from verse to verse that its musical effect is obtained. The curv is a veritabl line of beuty; the point of division sways with the movement of the thought like the index on the power gage of the dynamo as the cars move up and down the slopes of an electric road.

I. The prevailing foot is an IAMBUS, two syllabls with rising accent, the first syllabl being unaccented, the second syllabl having more stress and length than the first. In the first book of *Paradise Lost* ther ar 798 lines, 3990 feet. Of these, 2586 ar pure iambics.

The distribution by hundreds is as follows: —

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1-101 . . .	56	69	61	59	76 =	321
101-201 . . .	56	61	57	67	77 =	318
201-301 . . .	57	57	58	69	78 =	319
301-401 . . .	47	58	56	65	69 =	295
401-501 . . .	64	56	63	64	78 =	325
501-601 . . .	55	80	64	65	71 =	335
601-701 . . .	52	75	76	70	69 =	342
701-798 . . .	55	68	62	68	78 =	331

Total 2586

Only sixty-six lines ar holey pure iambics. Five pairs of like lines ar found: 452-3, 496-7, 538-9, 555-6, 617-8. A duzen other pairs differ only in the caesuras. Sumwhat more than one-third of the feet ar variations for harmony. See *Proceedings*, XIV, xi.

II. Of these many ar falling feet, the most common being the TROCHEE, — two syllabls, of which the first is accented and longer, the second unaccented.

The feet of this kind, arranged in their order by hundred lines, ar as follows: —

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1-101 . . .	14	1	3	3	0 =	21
101-201 . . .	13	1	3	1	0 =	18
201-301 . . .	23	1	4	7	0 =	35
301-401 . . .	22	2	2	2	0 =	28
401-501 . . .	12	0	5	2	0 =	19
501-601 . . .	23	0	4	2	0 =	29
601-701 . . .	22	0	2	4	0 =	28
701-798 . . .	15	1	3	1	0 =	20

The reason for so large a proportion being in the first place is twofold, metrical and historical; first, that after the voice has entered upon the regular series of iambic, rising cadences, it is not easy to change to a falling cadence; second, that the early English, Anglo-Saxon poetry prevailing begins its verses with trochees, because the accent is prevailing on the first syllable of every word.

In blank verse the falling first foot is useful to mark the beginning of verses, or sections.

The other place in which feet of this kind are found is after the caesura, at the beginning of the second section. All the examples in this book are in these places.

It may be noticed that the metrical reason will allow a trochee to follow another trochee. And sections having repeated trochees of this kind are found in other parts of Milton and in Shakespeare.

III. Another peculiar variation is the PYRRHIC, or two unaccented syllables, the time of the foot being eked out by a rest.

The most frequent and characteristic is divided by the verse caesura, but a pyrrhic may begin or end either section.

It is a slightly rising foot, except when beginning a section.

4. With loss of Ed | en || till | one greater man
5. Restore | us || and | regain the blissful seat.

The first syllable of the pyrrhic seems like a redundant close of the first section, the second syllable like an anacrusis of the second section; the caesura fills out the time of the foot; as if this pentameter was a development of the old tetrameter.

Another pyrrhic occurs when two unaccented syllables are found in a polysyllable with a rest of conformation.

100. *And to the fierce contention brought along*

101. *Innumerable force of spirits armed.*

The pyrrhics, arranged by the hundred lines, are in number as follows:—

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1-101 . . .	2	12	20	11	2	= 47
101-201 . . .	1	10	18	11	3	= 43
201-301 . . .	1	8	13	4	3	= 29
301-401 . . .	6	11	20	18	3	= 48
401-501 . . .	1	15	17	12	3	= 48
501-601 . . .	1	7	12	12	2	= 34
601-701 . . .	1	7	8	7	0	= 23
701-798 . . .	4	8	15	5	5	= 36
	<u>16</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>123</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>21</u>	= 318

The third foot has the most caesuras, and therefore the most pyrrhics.

IV. The most common variation is the SPONDEE or quasi-spondee, a foot of two syllables, both having stress, and dividing the time nearly equally.

This usually is a rising foot, having slightly more stress on the second syllable, making the simplest variation of the pure iambus. The following table shows the places and the times of its occurrence:—

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1-101 . . .	23	14	9	15	16 =	77
101-201 . . .	24	19	12	15	12 =	82
201-301 . . .	25	17	12	16	13 =	73
301-401 . . .	22	27	11	18	17 =	95
401-501 . . .	16	15	7	18	12 =	68
501-601 . . .	17	6	8	14	20 =	62
601-701 . . .	21	14	10	15	23 =	83
701-798 . . .	20	17	11	17	10 =	75
	<hr/> 158	<hr/> 129	<hr/> 80	<hr/> 128	<hr/> 123 =	<hr/> 618

The first foot is the one of easy variation.

The third foot contains the most frequent caesura, and therefore the least frequent spondee, since the two long syllabls fil the time. The spondee is frequently and naturally used as a foot of transition from the trochee to the iambus. As ther ar almost no trochees in the second place, ther ar no transition spondees in the third.

V. Another common variation is the ANAPEST, or two unaccented syllabls followd by an accented. The unaccented ar mostly syllabic consonants or glides.

6. Sing, heavenly *Muse*.

11. And *Siloa's brook*.

15. Above *the Ao|nian Mount*.

366. Through God's high sufrance, for the *trial of man*.

Lines.	First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.	Sum.
1-101 . . .	1	4	6	10	5 =	26
101-201 . . .	0	7	6	6	4 =	23
201-301 . . .	1	5	7	3	6 =	22
301-401 . . .	2	1	9	7	11 =	36
401-501 . . .	1	13	7	7	6 =	34
501-601 . . .	2	6	8	4	7 =	27
601-701 . . .	0	2	4	3	7 =	16
701-798 . . .	1	4	6	6	4 =	21
	<hr/> 8	<hr/> 42	<hr/> 53	<hr/> 46	<hr/> 50	<hr/> 199

VI. Feet of three unaccented syllabls mostly rising ar found with the rests.

1. Of man's first disobedience || *and* the fruit.

118. Since through *experience* | *of* this great event.

Of these ther ar in the book 22 feet.

First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.
0	8	10	5	2

156. Fallen cherub, to be weak is *miserable*.

VII. Ther ar a few FALLING SPONDAIC feet, 21 in all.

First foot.	Second foot.	Third foot.	Fourth foot.	Fifth foot.
16	0	2	3	0

They ar found in the same places as trochees, in the first foot of a section.

21. *Dove-like* sat'st brooding.

VIII. Ther ar also 12 DACTYLS.

87. *Myriads*, though bright.

280. *Groveling* and prostrate.

312. Abject and lost lay these, *covering* the floor.

They also as falling feet ar found at the beginning of sections.

IX. For falling pyrrhics, see III, above.

X. Twelv feet hav an unaccented close.

38. Of rebel angels ; by whose aid *aspiring*.

There ar no unmetrical lines.

Passages wer analyzed to point out their harmony and expressivness.

Remarks were made by Messrs. T. D. Seymòur and T. W. Hunt.

5. The Text of Richard de Bury's Philobiblon, by Professor Andrew F. West, of Princeton College, Princeton, N. J.

THE TEXT OF THE PHILOBIBLON OF RICHARD DE BURY.

FINISHED JAN. 24, 1345.

I. The Received Text of the Printed Editions.

Cologne, 1473.

Spires, 1483.

Paris, 1500.

Oxford, 1599.

Frankfort, 1610.

Frankfort, 1614.

Leipsic, 1674.

Helmstadt, 1703.

London, 1832.

Paris, 1856.

Albany, 1861.

London, 1888 (Morley's reprint).

Of these the Cologne, 1473, Spires, 1483 and Oxford, 1599, go back to manuscript sources.

II. The True Text as found in the Manuscripts.

1. Number of known extant Mss. is thirty-five. Apparently eight more lost or at present untraceable. Probably a number more of inferior Mss. in German libraries.

2. Classification of Mss. into two main kinds;—the *standard English tradition* and the *later German variants*.

3. The *standard English tradition* in over two-thirds of the Mss., including every Ms. known or suspected to be earlier than 1450, and none after 1460.

They may be classified according to the following general division.

COMPLETE TEXT { Prologue with collected list of chapter titles following and twenty chapters, each headed with a title separately, — colophon also?

(1) A B C D with sixteen others.

A = Ms. *R.* 8, *F.* *xiv.* in British Museum, date 1380.

B = Ms. *Digby* 147, Bodleian Library, date 1370.

C = Ms. 15168 in National Library, Paris, date 1440.

D = Ms. 3352c in National Library, Paris, date 1430.

INCOMPLETE TEXT — in three manuscripts.

Magdalen Ms. (VI. 164), Oxford, date about 1400, — lacks prologue and end of XIXth chapter.

St. John's Ms. (CLXXII), Oxford, date about 1400, — lacks last half of chapter IX, all of chapter X, and opening of chapter XI.

Brussels 11465, date early XVth century, — lacks collected chapter titles at end of prologue and separate titles at head of each chapter.

The headings, chapter titles, colophon and body of the text in the English tradition. Full form of the colophon (an integral part of the original text) is

Explicit Philobiblon domini Ricardi de Aungervile,
cognominati de Bury, quondam Episcopi Dunelmensis.

Completus est autem tractatus iste in manerio nostro de Aukelande xxiiij die
Januarii

anno Domini millesimo trecentesimo quadragesimo quarto,
aetatis nostrae quinquagesimo octavo praecise completo,
pontificatus vero nostri anno undecimo finiente,
ad laudem Dei feliciter et Amen.

4. The *later German variants* are at least seven in number. None earlier than 1450–60, and running on to 1492.

Copied in Germany.

The main variations are twofold.

(1) The chapter titles mainly or wholly changed. Due to what?

(2) The body of the text altered at pleasure, wherever unintelligible to scribe. Perhaps 1500 variations from the early English Ms., out of, say, 9000 words in the treatise.

The effect of this is of course to alter and obscure the meaning of the author, to debase his style.

5. From the German variants comes the received text of the Philobiblon, as seen in *editio princeps* Cologne 1473 and all the editions derived from it. From an arbitrarily altered poor English Ms. comes the Spire Ed. of 1483. From an uncritical examination of six English Mss. comes the Oxford Ed. of 1599. The English Mss. contain the true text. Two only certainly of XIVth century (A and B).

6. Mr. Thomas's Edition (London, 1888). The Grolier Club's Edition (1889, New York).

APPENDIX TO ABSTRACT.

General View of the Manuscripts of the Philobiblon.

I. THE ENGLISH TRADITION preserves the true text in twenty-three Mss. ranging in date from 1370 to 1450 or later.

Text substantially complete in twenty Mss. including ABCD and ranging in date from 1370 to 1450 or later.

Text defective in three Mss. from 1400 to 1430.

Brussels No. 11465. Early XVth century. Lacks heading, collected and separate chapter titles and colophon.

Magdalen Ms., Oxford. Date 1400. Lacks prologue and end of chapter XIX.

St. John's Ms., Oxford. Date 1400. Lacks end of chapter IX, all of X, and beginning of XI.

?

II. THE GERMAN VARIANTS, containing a corrupted text, without headings or with new headings, lacking collected chapter titles and colophons, and with new separate chapter titles. Not improbably originating from some incomplete Ms. of the English tradition (like Brussels 11465). Found in seven Mss. dating from 1450 to 1491. The *editio princeps* and printed texts derived from it come from this source.

III. UNCLASSIFIED Mss., five in number—

Two at Munich, one each at Venice, Bamberg, and Brüssels (No. 3725).

IV. LOST OR UNTRACEABLE Mss.—

Apparently eight in number.

6. Open Questions in English Philology, by Professor Theodore W. Hunt, of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.

After calling attention to the origin and history of the scientific study of English, and to the relation of settled to unsettled questions in philology, Professor Hunt invited the Association to consider some of the most important open questions in English philology. A brief abstract of the points stated and discussed is as follows:—

1. The question of English philological Nomenclature, with special reference to the use of the terms *Saxon*, *Anglo-Saxon*, *Anglo-Norman*, *Semi-Saxon*. It was held that we should adopt the one term *English* as applicable to all the different periods of the language.

2. The question of English philological Method among the possible methods open to the student, such as the comparative, etymological, and literary. Here it was urged that some one of these should be prominent, while emphasis was laid upon the literary side of linguistics as being more important than that conceded to it by general criticism.

3. The question of the relation of British English to American English. It was the object of the discussion, in this connection, to show the points of difference and of resemblance between these two branches or forms of English, and especially to press the principle of their substantial unity and co-operative growth. The true relation of English dialects to what are called provincialisms was here shown, while it was argued that the term *dialect* meant in England much more than it means in this country.

4. The question of the *native* English element in our Modern English vocabulary. The extreme and untenable theories on this subject were briefly stated, and

English scholars were warned against the tendency unduly to eliminate the native element in favor of foreign influence. Special notice was taken of the attempt to estimate far too highly the Celtic and Scandinavian influence in English.

5. The question of English Lexicography was then discussed, with primary reference to its rightful province. The encyclopedic tendency was noticed as the prevailing tendency in modern lexical work. Against this, ground was taken on the principle that it was far exceeding its rightful limits.

In conclusion, the paper made reference to the new and scholarly interest evinced in all departments of English philology, particularly, in its older periods and forms, and urged the importance of magnifying the intellectual and ethical elements in language above the merely verbal.

Remarks were made by Messrs. J. Sachs, F. A. March, and A. F. West.

7. Differentiation of the Uses of *shall* and *will*, by Professor George P. Garrison, of the University of Texas.

I take it that *shall* originally expressed a *present* necessity or obligation, and *will* a *present* volition or desire. It was very natural, however, to associate with these ideas of necessity and volition that of a subsequent result; and, as the use of *shall* and *will* as auxiliaries grew, they became auxiliaries for the future in so far as they carried this associated idea and kept less of their original meaning. Thus it came about that *shall go*, for example, signified: (1) a present necessity or obligation to go, and (2) a future result in the act of going. Similarly, *will go* signified: (1) a present desire or volition to go, and (2) a future result in the act of going.

But these ideas were not allowed to develop evenly. The Anglo-Saxon and his English descendant has always been domineering, inclined to magnify the importance of his own will and to regard lightly that of others. Under the influence of this quality, when he used *shall* with the first person he obscured the idea of necessity, because it was unpalatable to him, and dwelling upon the result made a pure future. But in the second and third persons he was willing enough for *shall* to imply necessity, especially if he were the agent that imposed it. He so used it, and in these two persons *shall* remained present. In using *will*, the same characteristic led him to make prominent the idea of volition in the first person and to obscure it in the second and third. Thus *will* has become mostly present in the first person, and future in the second and third.

Remarks were made by Messrs. F. A. March and T. D. Seymour.

At 12 M. the Association adjourned to meet at 1.30 P. M.

EASTON, PA., July 10, 1889.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association was called to order at 1.30 P. M. by the President.

8. On the Interpretation of Aristoph. Ach. 849, by Frank W. Nicolson, Esq., Instructor in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

The words *μῆ μαχαίρῃ* in this line are commonly understood to refer to the razor. The aim of this paper is to show that a form of shears is meant, and that the reference is to clipping and not shaving.

Another name for the *μία μάχαιρα* was *ψαλῖς* (cf. Pollux X. 140 and Photius' definition; cf. also Pollux II. 32, where the correct reading is not *διπλῇ*, but *μῆ*, as given by Mss. C. and V.). The words *μάχαιρα* and *μαχαίρις* do not, as generally supposed, relate to the razor, but to various forms of shears. (Cf. Arist. Frag. II. Thesm. and Lucian, Adv. Ind. 29, where these are mentioned respectively as distinct from the *ξυρόν*.) This is proved also by the order of the words in the two lists of barbers' implements given by Pollux (X. 140 and II. 32).

The shears used by the Greek barber were of two forms. The *διπλῇ μάχαιρα* resembled the form most common in modern days, consisting of two pieces of metal fastened together by a rivet in the middle. A representation is to be found in a terra-cotta from Tanagra (*vide* Arch. Ztg. XXXII. taf. 14). The *μία μάχαιρα* or *ψαλῖς*, on the other hand, was formed from a single piece of elastic metal bent in the middle and having the two edges sharpened. It is represented in a Pompeian wall-painting (*vide* Abh. der Sächs. Gesell. der Wiss. V. plate VI. 5). The word *ψαλῖς* means a vault or arch, and as applied to this form of shears no doubt refers to the curved or rounded end made by bending the metal on itself.

The *μία μάχαιρα* seems to have resembled in shape the old-fashioned sheep-shears still used in some parts of this country. There is evidence that it was employed by the ancients in sheep-shearing (cf. Hesychius' definition of *μάχαιραι*: οἷς ἀποκείρεται τὰ πρόβατα; cf. also Galen, quoted by Steph. in his Thesaurus, s.v. *κείρω*: *κείρεσθαι τὰ πρόβατα ὑπὸ τῶν ψαλίδων*). Lucian, Pisc. 46, proposes as a punishment for a false philosopher: *ἀποκείρω τὸν πώγωνα ἐν χρῆ πάνυ τραγοκουρικῇ μαχαίρᾳ*. These goat-shears were probably the same in form as the *ψαλῖς*, or sheep-shears, and a similar punishment to that proposed by Lucian may be here alluded to by Aristophanes.

That shears (*μάχαιραι κουρίδες*) served the double purpose of shearing sheep and clipping men's hair appears from a fragment of Cratinus, Dion. II. The *ψαλῖς* was particularly fitted for shearing sheep, since it could be operated by one hand, leaving the other free to manage the animal being sheared. Finally, the words of Phrynics, 319, seem to favor this interpretation: *τὸ μὲν γὰρ (i.e. καρῆναι, as opposed to κείρασθαι) ἐπὶ προβάτων τιθέασι καὶ ἐπὶ ἀτίμου κορυῷ*.

9. The Dramatic Features of Winter's Tale, by Professor Thomas R. Price, of Columbia College, New York, N. Y.

This play, which belongs to the last stage of Shakspeare's dramatic method, is not, as commonly conceived, a violation of the laws of dramatic construction, but an ingenious experiment in the application of those laws. It is constructed on the plan of the *diptych*, a form of art in which two compositions, each in itself complete, are merged into a composition of a higher kind, which comprehends them both. For this purpose, the drama divides itself into two (2) distinct parts, a tragedy of (28) twenty-eight scenes, ending at III. 3, 58, and a comedy of (22) twenty-two scenes, stretching from that point to the end. To carry on these two movements, the characters are divided into (3) three groups, one group of (9) nine characters that belong altogether to the tragedy, one group of (12) twelve

characters that belong altogether to the comedy, and one group of (7) seven characters that belong in common to the tragedy and to the comedy.

Of these two parts, each, according to the law of construction, is complete in itself. The tragedy has a *protasis* of 8 stages, an *epitasis* of 5 stages, a well-marked *climax* in II. 3, a *catabasis* of 5 stages, and a *catastrophe* of 3 stages. The comedy has a short *protasis* of only 3 stages, because many of the comedy-characters are known to us already from the tragedy. It has an *epitasis* of 5 stages, a well-marked *climax* in IV. 4, a *catabasis* of 10 stages, and a *catastrophe* of 2 stages. The only irregularity is the immense length of the comic *catabasis*; and this double length, 10 stages instead of 5, comes from the necessity of merging at this point the two movements into one catastrophe.

Thus Shakspeare, at the end of his career, worked out in the *Winter's Tale*, as a bold experiment in dramatic construction, the fusion of two distinct passions and of two distinct actions into a new form of romantic drama.

Remarks were made by Professor F. A. March.

10. Roman Elements in English Law, by Herbert L. Baker, Esq., of Detroit, Mich.

It is now a well-recognized fact that English law contains a very considerable Roman element.

The presence of this element presents a difficult problem in English legal history for the reasons that (1) Roman law was never recognized by the common law courts as having any authority in England, and (2) it has long been the accepted theory that the English common law is indigenous customary law deriving its sanction from immemorial usage—a theory which necessarily excludes foreign elements. The subject seems to have been hitherto discussed from a legal standpoint only and by means of comparisons instituted between rules existing in English and Roman law respectively. Such method of treatment assumes that the Roman element came in in the form of positive rules, and it is adapted to reaching only such part of it as came in thus, which part, there is reason to think, is but a small fraction of the whole. It is proposed here to view the subject from a philological standpoint. The fact that Roman law as such was excluded by English national policy and prejudice affords a hint that much the greater part of the Roman element must have effected its entrance in some form more subtle than that of positive rules. While Roman law as such was excluded, Roman legal thought, which may be regarded as Roman law held in solution, might and did enter into English thought unhindered and on practically an equal footing with other branches of ancient learning. If we can trace the Roman element as it exists in legal thought, it is evident that we shall thus arrive at a juster estimate of its character and extent than by a comparison of positive rules. A means of thus tracing the Roman element is afforded by the composite character of our language. English law has borrowed freely from Roman legal terminology; the words thus borrowed are capable of identification; wherever one of these words expresses thought which has never been expressed by a native word, it may justly be inferred that the thought also was borrowed, at least to the extent of the meaning attached to the word when it was adopted into English speech. The words belonging to our

legal terminology, as given in a standard law dictionary, number 1738. Of these 1363 are of Latin origin, and 375 are of other origin, mostly Anglo-Saxon. Very few, if any, of these Latin words have complete equivalents in words of native origin. It follows, therefore, that more than four-fifths of our elementary legal thought has been borrowed from the Romans. This general deduction must, like all such, be taken *cum grano salis*. Some allowance should doubtless be made for lost words and meanings of words, and for an affectation of Latinity on the part of lawyers and others. With such allowances, the conclusion is in the main justifiable, because none of the ideas represented by those words were ever communicated by one English-speaking person to another until it was done through the medium of the foreign word; and in order to render the idea thus communicable, both speaker and hearer must have learned the word and its meaning from the Romans.

For a complete acquaintance with the Roman element and its nature, a study in detail of individual words and their history is requisite. Some general idea may, however, be gained by a grouping of words according to subjects, and a comparison of the native and Roman elements as thus exhibited. The proportion of native and Roman words pertaining to some of the principal branches of the law are as follows: (1) *Public Law: Organic, International, etc.*, native words, 20; Roman, 135. (2) *Public Law: Criminal*, native words, 10; Roman, 54. (3) *The Law of Procedure*, native words, 7; Roman, 123. (4) *The Law of Property*, native words, 49; Roman, 171. (5) *The Law of Contract*, native words, 14; Roman, 112. Of the remaining 1043 words not embraced in either of the foregoing groups, 889 of the more important give 229 words of native and 660 of Roman origin. An examination of these groups discloses the fact that the Roman words, as compared with the native, are almost invariably expressive of ideas belonging to a more advanced and settled political society and shows in a striking manner in how great a degree the English state and its laws were developed upon intellectual lines marked out by the Romans. Thus in the first group (Organic Law) the native element gives us "baron," "barrister," "earl," "gerefa," "king," "queen," "lord," "sheriff," "thane," "borough," "hundred," "woodmote," "folkgemote," "shiregemote," "witanagemote," while the Roman element gives us "constable," "coroner," "surrogate," "attorney," "solicitor," "magistrate," "judge," "chancellor," "court," "county," "district," "municipality," "statute," "legislation," "Congress," "Parliament," "exchequer," "revenue," "sovereignty," "constitution," "government," "state," "nation," "society."

2. In the second group (Criminal Law) the words descriptive of offences against property are, (1) native, "blackmail," and "theft," (2) Roman, "arson," "burglary," "champerty," "embezzlement," "embracery," "forgery," "larceny," "maintenance," "piracy," "robbery." And the words pertaining to the administration of criminal law are almost wholly Roman, the native words being only "guilt" and "outlaw," as against twenty-eight Roman words, such as "arrest," "capital," "conviction," "crime," "defence," "indictment," "innocent," "penalty," "perjury," "prosecution," "punishment," "reward," "sentence."

3. The legal ideas contained in the law of procedure are expressed almost wholly in Roman words. The seven native words are "forswear," "oath," "set-off," "speaking," "wager," "battel." In contrast with these there are 123 Roman words with well-defined technical meanings, most of which are now in constant use.

4. In the law of property the native words are in greater proportion, but are of the same relative character. They are usually designative of material things; *e.g.*, "building," "dwelling," "farm," "homestead," "house," "land," "thing," while the Roman words usually designate more abstract conceptions, such as are involved in apprehending and defining the relations subsisting between persons in reference to material things; *e.g.*, "adverse," "common," "descent," "dower," "entail," "estate," "heir," "hereditament," "lease," "mortgage," "real," "rent," "seisin," "tenure," "title."

5. In the law of contract the same relative characteristics are exhibited, with a much larger proportion of Roman words. The native words are "bearer," "bond," "borrow," "bottomry," "breach," "drawer," "holder," "loan," "maker," "sale," "seller," "settlement," "sight," "warehouse." In contrast with these are 112 Roman words, such, for example, as "agreement," "bailment," "charter," "condition," "consent," "consideration," "contract," "covenant," "damages," "debt," "default," "due," "interest," "note," "obligation," "partner," "pledge," "principal," "promise," "special," "surety," "warranty," etc.

6. Of the unclassified words the following are examples of the more important: native, "free," "gift," "law," "mistake," "owner"; Roman, "custom," "duty," "general," "injury," "judicial," "juridical," "jurisprudence," "jury," "justice," "moral," "principal."

The position taken in this paper must not be understood too broadly. It is not asserted that prior to the adoption of any given Roman word the Anglo-Saxons had *nothing* of what afterwards came to be designated by that word. On the contrary, they had the *rudiments*, actually or potentially, of *all* that they afterwards acquired both with and without the aid of Roman ideas. The position here is that, by a kind of educational process, they gradually grew into and possessed themselves of these portions of the intellectual world which the Romans had created, and that the Roman words which they at the same time adopted, constitute an important record of the process by which Roman thought was thus taken up and assimilated. Thus, for example, as to the word "judge": some of the functions of judgeship were of course exercised among them before the borrowing of the word "judex" (such functions in more or less rudimentary form being exercised in all stages of organized society); but those functions were as yet but rudely conceived, and were bound up with, and were undifferentiated in thought from, legislative and executive functions. The introduction of the word "judex" to designate an officer charged only with judicial functions marks the beginning of that process of dividing up and distributing sovereign power which has led to the present well-established and familiar threefold division of sovereign power into Legislative, Executive, and Judicial.

So also the words "state," "nation," and "government" indicate, not that the Anglo-Saxons had nothing of what afterwards came to be designated by these words, but that they had not yet reached the stage of political development which would enable them to evolve the distinct and separate conception of a "state," a "nation," or an impersonal "government," and to produce the institutions properly corresponding to such conceptions.

Viewed thus as a part of our intellectual inheritance derived from ancient learning, the Roman element is seen to be very large, and at the same time it ceases to present an insoluble enigma. Its presence in English law can from this

standpoint be accounted for, but not without some modification of the theory above adverted to. For this reason amongst others a thorough study of this subject promises to be productive of important practical results, by leading to a critical examination of that theory *de novo* and thereby to a truer understanding of the essential nature of our law.

11. An Unstable Idiom in English, by Dr. C. P. G. Scott, of New York, N. Y.

At 3.30 P. M. the members of the Association and their friends, escorted by thirty gentlemen of Easton, of the Committee on Entertainment, proceeded in carriages to Paxinosa Inn, where a large part of the afternoon and evening was pleasantly spent in the grounds and on the piazzas of the hotel. Before dinner an address was made by William Hackett, Jr., Esq., Chairman of the Committee on Entertainment, to which President Seymour responded, and grace was said by President Knox.

At 7.45 P. M. the Association was called to order in the parlors of the Inn, and listened to communications from two of the members.

12. The Pronunciation near Fredericksburg, Va., by Professor Sylvester Primer, of the College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.

Prof. Edward A. Freeman, writing or speaking to a friend in regard to a young American who was going to the University of Jena in order to study Anglo-Saxon, remarked: "Why does he not go to Orange County, Va., instead of to Jena? They speak very good West Saxon in Orange County." This statement may serve as an introduction to my remarks on the pronunciation of Fredericksburg, Va. For Stafford, Spottsylvania, and Orange counties have about the same pronunciation, and have preserved to a remarkable degree the older English sounds brought over in the 17th century by the early settlers of this region.

This section of the country was the earliest settled. Stafford first appears as a county in 1666. Among the early names of the county are Scott, Moncure, Houseman, Mercer, Donithan, Tyler, Montjoy, Strother, Fitzhugh, Deyton, Daniel, Traverse, Cooke. Their descendants still live in various parts of the country. Spottsylvania was founded in 1720. Some of the prominent names are Taliaferro, Thornton, Lewis, Carter, Washington, Herndon, Ficklin. Orange County was formed later, dating from 1734. The principal families of Orange in colonial times are the Barbours, Bells, Burtons, Campbells, Caves, Chews, Conways, Daniels, Madisons, Moores, Ruckers, Shepherds, Taylors, Taliaferos, Whites, Thomases, and Waughns, whose descendants are still living.

As early as 1675 there was a fort on the present site of Fredericksburg, but it was not incorporated till 1727. Among the prominent names we find Robinson, Willis, Smith, Taliaferro, Beverly, Waller, Clowder, Mercer, Weedon, Lewis, Washington, Littleplace, Forsyth, Conway, Fitzhugh, Moncure, Carter, Lee, many of which are still prominent in and about Fredericksburg. In Fredericksburg

itself descendants of Carter Braxton, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, are still living. A comparison of the earlier names with those of the present inhabitants shows that the present families represent almost exclusively the earlier families. Intermixture from without has not been great, foreigners have rarely sought homes here, and immigration from other states has been limited.

The early settlers were men of education. They studied at Cambridge, Oxford, Dublin, and Edinburgh, and at Temple Bar. Professional men were all educated in England. For the poor almost no provision was made. Sir William Berkeley in his day rejoiced that there was not a free school or printing-press in Virginia, and hoped it might be so for a hundred years to come. The rich had private tutors at their own houses, the poor remained ignorant. There were no libraries of any account. The sons of the rich were sent to England for their education up to the time of the Revolution. "The College of William and Mary, from the year 1700 and onward, did something toward educating a small portion of the youth of Virginia, and that was all until Hampden Sidney, at a much later period, was established." However poor the school system of the colony and young state was, the education of the superior class has ever been a matter of pride. Virginia has produced more great men than any other state, and the intellectual life has ranked high. She has won for herself the proud title of the "Mother of Presidents."

The English of the 17th century, with proper regard to that of the 16th and 18th centuries, forms the basis of the comparison of Fredericksburg's present pronunciation. Three extracts from early documents of Virginia with the approximate pronunciation of that day are given, and the pronunciation of the present traced back to that. The first is taken from The First Assembly of Virginia, held July 30, 1619. The second is from A Briefe Declaration of the Plantation of Virginia. The third is from Captain Smith's True Relation.

The tabular view of the Virginia Sounds at this period will be best understood in connection with the extracts in the full article; it would be impossible to give either here in this brief extract. A few of the more prominent peculiarities of the Fredericksburg pronunciation are given to show the tenor of the article.

The sound (i). The word "tester" is here pronounced (tiister) as in Charleston, S. C. In Latin words like *simultaneous*, etc., the *i* is generally pronounced (əi, səi-mel-tee-ni-əs), rarely (i). In words like *Palestine* the sound fluctuates between (əi) and (ii), but inclines mostly to the latter. *Ef* for *if* is sometimes heard. For *mill*, *hill*, I heard in two instances (mil, Hil) quite distinctly, but am not sure that it was not an individual rather than general pronunciation. The word *ear* is here pronounced (yiir) by the vulgar.

The long and short *e* differ but slightly from the accepted pronunciation elsewhere. The shades between this and the next sound (æ) show a diversity of sounds in words that generally have the sound (æ) and in Charleston, S. C., have (ee). Words like *here*, *pare*, *pair*, *tare*, *bear*, etc., which in Charleston generally have the sound (æ) or (ææ), are divided in Fredericksburg between (ii), (æ) and (ee). The sound (ee) is somewhat common in many of these words, but not so common as the Charleston (ee). In some the sound is short (E). There is the same fluctuation between (agEn) and (ageen), (agEnst) and (ageenst) as is found everywhere. The Latin prefix *pre-* has the two sounds (ii) and (e) in

words like *predicessor* (prii-di-sesɪ, or pred-i-sesr). The word *here* sometimes has a peculiar pronunciation. It is often pronounced (ˈjɪr). The sound *e* and *a* exchange in *yes* and *well* (pr. yas, wal); *e* also exchanges with *i* in *yesterday*, *yes*, *yet*, *get*, *kettle*, etc. (pr. yis, yit, etc.).

The long sound of (æ) is heard in *calm*, *psalm*, *balm*, etc. (pr. kææm, sææm, bææm, etc.). But the ordinary pronunciation is also heard (kaam, saam, baam). The words *ask*, *demand*, are also divided between the sound (æ) and (aa) (ææsk or aask). Compare also (pææs or paas), and we even hear (paas or pas). *Passable* and *Possible* are said to be indistinguishable in their pronunciation by many. Words in *au*, like *gaunt*, *daunt*, etc., have three grades, (æ), (aa), and (AA). These different pronunciations here mentioned are all found among the cultured, and is said to be traditional in families. As they all go back to the 17th century, they were probably brought over here and handed down from father to son.

There are one or two peculiarities under the *a*-sound. Among the vulgar the words *there*, *where*, are pronounced (dhar, whar). The genuine *a*-sound is heard in various words that have in other localities the (æ) or (e) sound. *Mayor* sounded to me as spoken by one person (maa-r). *Stairs* are often called (staars) by the illiterate, *bears* (baars), etc.

The A-sound is heard in *dog* and *God* (dag, Gad, and even daag, GAAD). But the ɔ-sound may also be heard in these words (dɔg, Gɔd, and dɔɔg, Gɔɔd). The words *not*, *God*, *gaud*, form a rising scale. *Not* is short, *God* is longer, and *gaud* is longest (ɔ, A, AA), and we generally find *dog* and *God* running through the whole scale in the same locality. In Fredericksburg I have heard (dɔg, Gɔd, dag, Gad, daag, GAAD). The word *pond* varies in its pronunciation in different sections of the country. All three sounds can be found in Charleston, S. C. (pɔnd, pAnd, pAAnd). The careless often pronounce it just like the word *pawnd*; the elegant pronunciation is the middle sound of our series (pAnd); many pronounce it (pɔnd). In Fredericksburg the first and second (pɔnd, pAnd) are heard, never the third. The word *hog* (generally Hɔg, or Hɔɔg) is often pronounced (HAg or HAAG) in Fredericksburg.

The *o*-sound has one or two peculiarities. The word *poor* almost always has the long sound of *o* and drops its *r* (poo). For the dropping of the *r* see under *r* in the consonants. The two pronunciations of *progress*, *process*, (prɔɔgres, proogres, prɔɔses, prooses) prevail here. The preposition *to* often has the older pronunciation of (too), as in the time of Chaucer and Shakespeare, now becoming obsolete.

The long *u* appears to have more of the *i*-Vorschlag in certain words than ordinarily, making it almost a distinct syllable. I am almost inclined to think that it is rather a (y)-Vorschlag. Thus *due* (*dew*), *do*, *too*, etc., sound to me (dü-u, tü-u, or dy-u, ty-u), with the accent on the (ü or y). Some, however, regularly pronounce these words (diu², tiu²) where the ² denotes a prolonged vanish. The word *put* (also in a less degree *could*, *would*, *should*) shows the same peculiarity as in Charleston, S. C. It is frequently pronounced (pət, rarely kəd, wəd, shəd). More probably the peculiar sound of *could*, *would*, *should* is the same as that heard in *prove*, *move*, and others. The sound here is to me a diphthong beginning with an (y) and ending with (u), thus (pry-uv, my-uv; perhaps ky-ud, etc.). The two sounds follow each other very rapidly, and it is difficult to

detect the two shades of sound of the first and second components of the diphthong. The word *spoon* has the same sound (spy-un), but see under diphthongs. The *u*-sound in *fruit* appears to me to be quite peculiar. As near as I can make out it sounds nearly like the double French *u*, thus (fry-yt); the word appears to be dissyllabic, though the last syllable may be only the prolonged vanish. I have also noticed this same sound in people from the middle and upper part of the state of South Carolina. It has puzzled me very much. This sound may be the (yy), or the (yyw), or the (yy) with a labial modification. I hardly consider it the (iu). All these shades of sound have been handed down from the 17th century.

The diphthongs show quite a number of peculiarities. Jones (1701) says that *ai* has the sound of *a* in some words. Ellis thinks the two sounds indicated by Jones were (ee) and (ee), and though *ai* was sounded *a* by some people, it was not considered best. Jones gives quite a long list, among which we notice the word *stair* (pronounced *staar* by some), already mentioned. Here belongs also *bear*, an animal, pronounced (baar) by some. We have noticed the pronunciation of *due*, *do*, etc. This leads us to consider the diphthong *eu*, which Ellis says the Americans pronounce (iu) rather than (iu), and even (eu) remains here in some parts. I believe it possible to hear all three in America. In Fredericksburg I am inclined to think (iu) or even (üu) is the prevailing pronunciation. Some prolong it so that I heard (nieu), (dieu), etc. The (au) becomes (æu) in *house* (Hæus), where it is short. In *town* it is long (tææun). In *out* it is very short (æut). Thus we have very short in (*out*, *about*, *south*, etc), short (in *house*, etc.), and long (in *town*, *cow*, etc.). The (ou) is heard in Fredericksburg, but not in *house*. There it is more often heard in *boat*, and similar words. As near as I could make out, I heard the sound (bout) in the pronunciation of *boat* almost always. Frequently I thought I detected the sound (baut), but the (A) was very short. The pronunciation of *spoon*, *could*, *point*, *shook*, *good* (almost gyüd), has been mentioned.

There is little to be said of the consonants. The (*h*) often suffixes a (*j*) and becomes a breathing, as ('jeer) for *here* (Hür). The exchange of *w* for *v*, as *prowok*, *wocation*, for *provoke*, *vocation*, is no oftener heard here than elsewhere. In the combination *wh* both letters are sounded. The *r* is at all events an evanescent sound and difficult to detect. In Fredericksburg it disappears in words like *more*, *door*, *floor*, *war*. And yet its influence is felt. Professor March told me that he explained this peculiar pronunciation of the final *r* after vowels as an attempt to pronounce the *r* by assuming the *r* position after the enunciation of the vowel and then stopping just before the real enunciation of the *r*. This appears to me to be the true explanation. Indicating the preparation for the *r* by (') this peculiar pronunciation may be expressed (mo', doo', floo', wa').

The usual dropping of the *g* in *ing* is heard here as elsewhere. The consonants *g* and *k* insert the (*j*) after them. Thus *cart*, *garden*, *girl*, etc., are pronounced (kjart, gjardn, etc.). Even *school* seems to fall under this rubric and becomes sometimes (skjuul).

The accent of the word *idea* has changed here to the antepenult (*idea*).

The above is only a beginning of studies of the pronunciation of Fredericksburg, and I hope hereafter to continue them. Any suggestions, corrections, or information will be gladly received.

Remarks were made by Messrs. A. F. West, T. R. Price, and F. A. March.

13. Some Syriac Legends, by Professor Isaac H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, New York, N. Y.

This was intended as an informal communication rather than a regular paper, and in fact was a mere talk. The legends spoken of were (1) The Legend of Romulus and Remus and the founding of Rome, and (2) a collection of legends in a manuscript recently received from Urmî in Persia, which are extant in a few manuscripts in Karshûn, but not heretofore found in Syriac. These were: A Colloquy of Moses with the Lord on Mount Sinai; The Letter of Holy Sunday that fell from Heaven upon the Hands of Athanasius Patriarch of Rome, being the Third Letter [of its sort]; and The Narrative of Arsenius King of Egypt, and how our Lord raised him to life (containing an account of man's experiences at and after death, with a description of Gehenna).

Since the legends in the Urmî manuscript need the Syriac text for proper appreciation, they will be published elsewhere; and no abstract of them is fairly called for here. The legend of Romulus and Remus seems to be of interest to the Association, however, and a translation of it is therefore given here. The original is to be found in a Nitrian manuscript written A.D. 837 (Brit. Mus. Addit. 12152, fol. 194 ff.). The text is printed in Paul de Lagarde's *Analecta Syriaca* (pp. 201-205), a work of which 115 copies were issued. A partial translation is to be found in B. Harris Cowper's *Syriac Miscellanies*, a work now quite scarce. It is a fragment from the Roman History of Diocles, and bears probable marks of translation from the Greek.

As the legend is quite closely connected with the preceding one of the settlement of Syria, Cilicia, and Phœnicia, it seems best to give the whole together. A distorted form of that portion which treats of Hercules and the Tyrian purple occurs also in a much later composition called the "Cave of Treasures," of which at least one manuscript exists in New York, and which Bezold has published in German and Syriac under the title of *Die Schatzhöhle* (Leipzig, 1883, 1888). In the "Cave of Treasures," however, Hiram King of Tyre replaces Punicus, and Hercules is suppressed — perhaps as a character not altogether in place in a strictly religious composition.

The following is the translation: —

THE WRITING OF DIOCLES THE WISE.

Now after the division of tongues in the days of Peleg there was [born] a certain man of the sons of Japhet, who was called Ag'ûr (or, Ig'ûr). This one went up from the east and came and dwelt on the sea-shore, and built a city and called its name Ge'ûr, which in the Syriac tongue is called Tyre (Ŝûr). And there were [born] to him three sons, Syrus (Ŝûrôs) his first born, and Cilicus (Qûlîqôs) his second, and Punicus (Pûnîqôs) his third. And Ag'ûr their father was king in Tyre 13 years. And when he died he divided the land to his sons; to Punicus he gave Phœnicia (Pûntqâ, or Pûnîqî), and to Cilicus he gave Cilicia (Qlîlqyâ, or Qlîlqyâ), and to Syrus he gave Syria (Ŝûriyâ).

And in the time of Punicus was [born] Hercules (Heraqlîs, or Harqlîs), a man

wise and mighty in valor. For when this hero was commanding¹ upon the sea-shore of Tyre, he saw a certain shepherd's dog capture a shell-fish of the sea, that is called *conchylum*, and eat of it, so that the dog's mouth was stained with the blood of the shell-fish. And Hercules called to him the shepherd of the flock, and told him about the dog; and forthwith the shepherd brought wool, and with it wiped out the mouth of the dog, and of the wool the shepherd made himself a crown and put it upon his head. Then when the sun shone upon it, Hercules saw the crown of wool, that it was very splendid, and he was astonished at its beauty; and he took the crown from the shepherd. But the next day Hercules took the shepherd and the dog, and went out to the sea-shore. And the dog, as he was walking along, saw a shell-fish, and the dog ran and caught it; but Hercules snatched the shell-fish from his mouth, and let the shepherd go to his flock. And Hercules walked every day upon the sea-shore, and as soon as one of those shell-fish came out from the sea, he ran quickly and caught it. So he gathered 30 of them, and he boiled them over a fire, and dyed white wool with their blood. And he gave it to a certain woman, and she made of it for him a garment, and he took that clothing and brought it in to Punicus the king of Tyre, who, when he saw it, wondered at its beauty, and commanded that no one except himself should wear it, but the king (or, the one acting as king) only. And moreover, he gave to Hercules authority to be commander in his place, and wrote that he was the father of the kingdom [*i.e.* prime minister]. And it was this Hercules that showed the dyeing of all manner of beautiful colors; and how, moreover, pearls go up from the sea he showed and taught to men.

In those days there was [born] a man in the country of the west, whose name was Rômtyâ (or Rômtyâ or Rômayâ, = *Ῥωμαῖος*); and the man was a mighty hero. Now in his days there was in the island of Cilicia a certain virgin beautiful in appearance, who had been made priestess in the temple (*ναὸς*) of the god Arts (*Ἄρτης*). And when Rômtyâ saw [her], he lusted after her, and he went in unto her, and she conceived from him. And when she perceived that she had conceived from him, she was in great fear, and kept herself close, in order that the priests of the god Arts should not detect it and kill her. And when she had borne two twins [*sic* — idiomatic], their father took them and gave them to a certain woman, who reared them. And when the boys were grown up and become men, their father gave them names; to the one Romulus (Rômullôs, Rômillôs, or Rômel-lôs), and to the other Remus (Rômôs). And they built the city Rome (Rômâ or Rômî) and . . .² it, and all their subjects³ they called Romans (Rômâyê = *Ῥωμαῖοι*) after the name of their father; and for this reason the sons of Rome are called Romans. And, moreover, they built the capitol (*qâpitôlôn*), which interpreted is, the Head of the city; and it is one of the wonders of the whole earth [*lit.* one out of the wonders that are in the whole earth]. And they brought a great image that had been in Helûdûs (or Helôdôs, possibly *Ἑλλάδος*, genitive),⁴

¹ A rather difficult word; probably the imported *παραγγέλλω*, in a peculiar reflexive participial form. "On a tour of inspection and improvement" is perhaps the meaning.

² Part of word obliterated. Probably "ruled as kings in" is to be supplied.

³ This is the right rendering if I guess rightly how to supply the obliterated place preceding. Otherwise, "workmen" or "cultivators."

⁴ If this conjecture is correct, then the rendering of the clause is "that had been in [the land] of Hellas."

and raised and set it above the top of the capitol, and it was a great wonder, whose like has not been on the earth. And they built the great *dimôstlôn* (*δημόσιον*) that is in Athens (*Athlnis*, = *Athēnis*, *Ἀθήναις*), and the philosophers called it the *dimôstlôn* of wisdom (*sôphlâ*).

Now then there arose a quarrel between the two brothers, and Romulus (*Armîllôs*, *Armellôs*, or *Armullôs*, = *δ' Ῥώμος*) rose up and slew his brother Remus. And straightway the city began to quake; and when the sons of Rome saw that their city was quaking, they feared with great fear, and all its inhabitants sought to flee out of it. And when Romulus saw that the sons of Rome were in commotion at the temple (*vads*) of the goddess *Pûthinayâ* (or *Pûthintâ*, or *Pûthinyâ* — or perhaps better, of the Pythian goddess), he asked of her that she would reveal to him for what cause the city was quaking. And she answered him, "Because you have slain your brother the city is quaking and mourning; because he built it with you. And there will be no cessation from the earthquake until it [*i.e.* the city] sees your brother sitting with you upon the throne of the kingdom, and commanding and writing and proclaiming with you as formerly."

Now when this saying was heard throughout the city, they assembled to stone Romulus with stones, because he had slain his brother. But he fled from them and went up to Athens. And when the philosopher Punitus (*Pûnitôs*, *Pônîtôs*) heard of him, he went and listened to the words of Romulus, and promised him that if he would write for him Athens as a free city [*lit.* daughter of freemen, or of nobles], so that no king of the Romans should have authority over her, he would go to Rome and restore tranquillity to the sons of the city and to his powers. And he made a covenant with him that he would do that for him. And Punitus went to Rome and spoke with them, and said to them, "If ye will receive your king in peace, this earthquake will cease forthwith from your city, so that it shall not again quake. But if ye do not receive him your whole city will perish." And forthwith all the sons of Rome assembled and went up after their king to Athens. And when they had arrived [there], and had come [back] and reached Rome (*Rômt*), the whole city went out to receive him; and they answered and said to him, "If it be that you know that by your entrance into the city the quaking will cease from it, come, enter in glory and honor, and sit on the throne of your kingdom. But if the earthquake will not cease from us, do not enter." But he promised them, "This earthquake will cease from the city."

And the same philosopher made an image of gold after the likeness of his brother, and seated it with him upon the throne of his kingdom. And he commanded them that whatever was done or written should be as if from the mouth of the two. And they did so, and forthwith the earthquake ceased from the city. Thus by the wisdom of this man that earthquake ceased, and the inhabitants with their king were tranquillized. And thenceforward the Romans fixed that it should be the custom to write and command, saying [*i.e.* in the form], "We command." And Athens received freedom from that time on, that no king should have authority over her to do in her anything by force. And this same Armellus (Romulus) instituted an equestrian display (*ippîqton*, a corruption of *ἵππικόν*) for [the] amusement [of the people], and he instituted the *martius*, and he was the first to institute the *veneti*¹ and the *prasini*¹; for because he was afraid of the sons . . .²

¹ An anachronistic reference to colors worn in the hippodrome.

² A word or more defaced. Perhaps "of Rome, that they" is to be supplied.

would kill him as he had killed his brother, he established before him two men that hated each other, one from the *veneti* and one from the *prasini*; for, said he, "If it be that the *veneti* plot against me, the *prasini* will make it known to me; and if the *prasini* plot against me, the *veneti* will make it known to me" . . .¹ two men before . . .¹ of the city as if for amusement. And he clothed the one of the *veneti* in clothing of the sea, and the other in clothing of the *prasini*, which was like the grass of the earth. And he said, "If indeed this one conquers that is clothed like the *veneti*, the sea will be quieted, and the barbarians will not invade and obtain authority in the islands of the sea; as regards them that dwell in the sea, these will take the victory, and those that dwell on the dry [land] will be conquered. But if, again, he that is clothed like the *prasini* conquers, they that dwell on the dry [land] will conquer, and subdue those that dwell in the seas." And forthwith as these two men advanced to contend one with the other, those that dwelt in the sea prayed that the [one of the] *veneti* might win, but those that dwelt on the dry [land], that the [one of the] *prasini* might win. And from that time even until now there have been these two divisions of the kingdom of the Romans, of the *veneti* and the *prasini*. And Armellus (Romulus) instituted the *brumalia*, because he was a man that loved instruction, and that loved amusement, and that loved the youth; and he commanded that in the days of winter men should be calling one upon another, and that many should assemble, assembling with one, and should eat and drink and enjoy themselves. And he commanded that the letters of the alphabet should be coming in one after another, and every one of them should be called in its day. And they called them [*i.e.* those days] *brumalia*, which is, interpreted in the Greek language, "Let us eat and drink off others," that is *gratis*. And there was . . .² a grade of nobility at Rome, and he gave to the nobles the great honor of a throne and authority, that they should command and be obeyed. And he ordained that there should be *qûblarê* (cubi[cu]larii?) in the kingdom of the Romans, that is, that they should be servants in the kingdom. And he sent to Athens and brought thence the philosophers GLSOS (or GLSUS, Gelasus, Glesus, or -sys?) and LThROS (or -US, Lathrus, Lathyrus, Lathrys, etc.?), and made them an organ, that they might be delighted with beautiful sounds. And Armellus (Romulus) instituted the *katâ-dromôn*, and commanded that when the sons of Rome were assembled at the capitol the boys should go down by a rope from the top of the capitol to the bottom, sitting on a wheel and offering a crown to the kingdom, just as if a heroic crown were going down to [the place] of Nimrod, and that the kings should be givers of gifts to those little boys when they returned to come up again. And again he ordained that the Romans should take turns, that in order that they might be supported all the winter, so in the summer they should be going forth to war against their enemies. And he ordained and established *veredi* (*i.e.* post-couriers or post-horses), to serve as relays and bring news to the kings from the armies. And the day in which the Romans went out to war and called it *martius*,³ also interpreted victory . . .⁴ and . . .⁴ great marvels and various deeds and excellent laws and upright commands he executed and established in Rome

¹ Words defaced.

² A word or more defaced.

³ Perhaps the month of March (Martius) is meant.

⁴ Some words defaced.

(Rômt). Among all the Romans there was no man like him excelling in all knowledge and wisdom, nor so honored by those that have understanding. And in his intellect he was so rich that whosoever saw him and spoke with him was discovered, the bad from the good and the false from the true . . .

At 9 P. M. the Association adjourned to meet at 8.30 A. M., Thursday.

EASTON, PA., Thursday, July 11, 1889.

MORNING SESSION.

Professor Seymour, the President, called the Association to order at 8.30 A. M.

The report of the Committee to nominate Officers was presented by L. H. Elwell, Esq., and adopted. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, the following gentlemen were elected officers of the Association for 1889-90 : —

President, Professor Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Vice-Presidents, Dr. Julius Sachs, New York, N. Y., and Professor John H. Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Secretary and Curator, Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Treasurer, Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth.

Additional members of the *Executive Committee*,—

Professor Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Professor Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Professor Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.

Professor William D. Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The Committee appointed to propose Time and Place for the next meeting reported, through Professor Peck, that invitations had been received to hold the meeting in 1890 at Norwich, Conn., Northampton, Mass., and Princeton, N. J. The Committee recommended that the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting be held on the second Tuesday in July, 1890, at Norwich, Conn.

The report was accepted and adopted.

On motion, the matter of effecting a union of meetings between the Modern Language Association and the Association was referred to the Executive Committee to report at the Norwich meeting.

The report of the Committee to audit the Treasurer's Accounts was presented by Dr. H. W. Smyth, to the effect that the accounts, with the accompanying vouchers, had been examined and found correct.

14. John Reuchlin and the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, by Morris H. Stratton, Esq., of Salem, N. J.

The object of this paper was to call attention again to the fact that the great contest between the monks of Cologne and John Reuchlin was really an attempt to smother classical literature in its cradle.

The facts and dates given were taken from the printed "Case" of the trial at Rome, of the appeal of Hoogstraten, the Inquisitor at Cologne, from the judgment of the Bishop of Spire — which appeal was decided in favor of Reuchlin in 1516 — and from the letters of Pirkheimer, Erasmus, and others, printed in Van der Hardt's *Historia Litteraria Reformationis*. Luther's letters to Reuchlin, also printed by Van der Hardt, fully and frankly acknowledge how much the Reformer owed to the Scholar who had preceded him.

The *Epistolae obscurorum virorum* were quoted to show that the first attack of the mendicant monks — in which they were fatally worsted and the back of the Inquisition was broken — was against the revival of classical literature as such. These letters are, of course, a satire, but the well-known facts as to the reception of them — even by their unconscious victims — prove that they were thoroughly verisimilar if not true.

Reuchlin and Erasmus opened the doors to the study of the Testaments in the original tongues, but that they were opposed as scholars and not as disseminators of a wider knowledge of the Bible was illustrated, *inter alia*, by the fact that among the hundreds of editions of the Bible in modern tongues issued in the Fifteenth Century, a very fine folio Bible, in the local German, with illustrations, was published in Cologne, between 1470 and 1475, without objection from Hoogstraten, and that Koburger published a superb illustrated Bible at Nuremburg, known as the *ninth* German Bible, in 1483 — the year in which Luther was born.

Reference was made to the great services of Ulrich von Hutten, one of the editors of the *Epistolae*, and the author of the "*Triumphus Capnionis*." Sir Wm. Hamilton defends Hutten's authorship of the *Triumphus* — and from this the fact that he was one of the three editors of the *Epistolae* — with great learning and ability in an article on the *Epistolae* and their authorship, in the *Edinburgh Review* of March, 1831; and Van der Hardt assumes it as unquestioned that Hutten wrote the *Triumphus*. This savage satire is referred to, however, by Henry Charles Lea, in his *History of the Inquisition* — Vol. II. pp. 424-25 — as written by Eleutherius Bizenus, Hutten's *nom de plume*.

The inaccurate and misleading account of Reuchlin and of his contest with the monks, in the work referred to, was given as one of the reasons for writing this paper.

Professor Francis A. March, as Chairman of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, reported that no action had been taken during the last year. The manual dictionary with amended spellings has not yet been made.

A report was made April 8, 1889, by the Commission on Amended Orthography authorized by the Legislature of Pennsylvania. The Commission asked aid from the American Philosophical Society, Super-

intendents of Education, and others, and the printed report contains, as appendixes, elaborate arguments in favor of reform by a committee of the American Philosophical Society, and by Hon. W. T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, with various statistics.

The practical recommendation of the Commission is as follows : —

The Commission would call attention to the fact that many words are spelt in two ways in our dictionaries, and that it is therefore necessary for a choice to be made between the different spellings. We find “honor” and “honour,” “traveller” and “traveler,” “comptroller” and “controller,” and hundreds of such pairs. In these words one way of spelling is better than the other on grounds of reason, simpler, more economical, more truthful to sound etymology and scientific law.

The Commission respectfully submits that the regulation of the orthography of the public documents is of sufficient importance to call for legislative action, and recommends that the public printer be instructed, whenever variant spellings of a word are found in the current dictionaries, to use in the public documents the simpler form which accords with the amended spelling recommended by the joint action of the American Philological Association and the English Philological Society.

FRANCIS A. MARCH,
THOMAS CHASE,
H. L. WAYLAND,
ARTHUR BIDDLE,
JAS. W. WALK,
SAMUEL A. BOYLE.

Professor W. D. Whitney, in the preface to the *Century Dictionary*, May 1st, 1889, takes similar ground : “The language is struggling toward a more consistent and phonetic spelling, and it is proper, in disputed and doubtful cases, to cast the influence of the dictionary in favor of this movement, both by its own usage in the body of the text, and at the head of articles by the order of forms, or the selection of the form under which the word shall be treated.”

The report was accepted, and the Committee appointed in 1875 was continued for another year. It now consists of Messrs. March (Chairman), Child, Lounsbury, Price, Trumbull, and Whitney.

15. A Northumbrianized Judith Text, with Commentary, by Professor Albert S. Cook, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn. ; read by Professor F. A. March.

16. Stressed Vowels in Ælfric’s Homilies (late West Saxon), by Professor Albert S. Cook, of Yale University, New Haven, Conn. ; read by Professor F. A. March.

On motion of Professor A. F. West, a resolution was adopted as follows : —

The American Philological Association desires to place on record, before finally adjourning, the hearty expression of its thanks to the President and Faculty of Lafayette College for the use of the various college buildings, to the Local Committee of Arrangements and its Chairman, Professor Owen (of Lafayette), to the Committee of the gentlemen of Easton for the very pleasant excursion taken under their guidance to Paxinosa, and to the newspapers of Easton for their full and accurate reports of the proceedings of the Association.

17. The Study of English in Preparation for College, by Professor Francis A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Accurate knowledge of the mother tongue is fundamental to all valuable thinking. It is to be obtained by studying classic English authors substantially in the same way that Greek is studied in good schools: that is to say, by studying each word etymologically and in its connection so as to comprehend its meaning, and by studying each clause and sentence in its connection so as to repeat the train of thought of the author. This study should be recognized as different from reading literature for pleasure or for esthetic or bibliographic culture. The paper discusses the desirableness of a general agreement among the colleges upon some two or three English books of moderate size for the entrance examinations, to be put on the same footing as the *Anabasis* and *Iliad* in Greek. Franklin's *Autobiography* and two books of *Paradise Lost* were suggested. If they were generally adopted, editions would be prepared for study of the right sort by the most accomplished professors, and a tradition of good teaching of them would soon be established in the fitting schools.

Remarks were made by Messrs. W. D. Shipman, T. Peck, J. Sachs, T. R. Price, and F. A. March.

18. The Relation of the Greek Optative to the Subjunctive and the other Moods, by Professor William W. Goodwin, of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; read by Professor J. H. Wright.

This paper has appeared in the new (1890) edition, of Professor Goodwin's *Greek Moods and Tenses*, Appendix I.

19. A New Source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero, by Dr. A. Gudeman, of New York, N. Y.

After some introductory remarks on the method to be followed in investigations of this nature, on the inherent difficulties to be encountered, on Plutarch's mode of work and on the degree of proficiency in Latin which we may safely assume him to have attained, the lecturer briefly reviews the authors usually regarded as the chief sources of the Greek life. The investigations hitherto made have, however, been almost entirely confined to ascertaining the sources of Plutarch's narrative of Cicero's *political history*, and, in consequence, but slight attention was paid to the "Quellen" of those portions of the *vita* which deal more particularly with the personal and literary side of the great orator. Cicero's voluminous life of his patron was generally supposed to have furnished Plutarch with the bulk of his purely biographical material, while Cicero's autobiographical

writings, as well as Augustus' memoirs, were considered as secondary sources.¹ All the writers, however, that have been suggested as the original sources of Plutarch's narrative were either contemporary with Cicero or nearly so. That the Greek historian may also have consulted much later authorities has not, as far as I am aware, ever been hinted at. It is the object of this paper to show: 1. That Plutarch actually made use of *one*, or, if you will, several *post-Augustan* writers. 2. That one of these post-Augustan sources is no other than *Suetonius Tranquillus' Life of Cicero*, which formed a part of his famous work *De viris illustribus*.

The first of these propositions is conclusively demonstrated by ch. 2 of the *Life*, containing a criticism of Cicero's poetical abilities.² The beginning of ch. 40, and a few other passages, also point to a post-Augustan source.

The proof for the second thesis is furnished by ch. III, 11 sqq. This passage contains two *misstatements* of such a nature as to exclude Tiro, Nepos, Fenestella, etc., as their possible authors. We can only attribute them to a writer remote enough in point of time to render the error excusable. Who can this be? The identical error is fortunately found in *two* other authors, and in *only two*, besides Plutarch, and their names are *Hieronimus* and *Sextus Aurelius Victor*. Now, one of the sources of Hieronimus (as has never been denied) and of Victor's *De viris illustribus* (as can be shown) is Suetonius' work of the same name. The erroneous statements in question, therefore, not being met with elsewhere, and remembering how much safer a clue to inter-dependence of authors is afforded by coincidences of palpable errors than by concurrences in well-known facts, it follows that Suetonius is the common source of Plutarch, Aurelius Victor, and Hieronimus.

This new source having once been discovered, we are at liberty to look for other statements whose origin we had been hitherto unable to determine with any degree of probability. A number of such passages having a genuine color Suetonianus, ch. 2, quoted above, being among these, is accordingly pointed out as being very probably derived from Suetonius' *vita*; and taken altogether, they certainly possess all the argumentative validity of strong cumulative evidence.

The paper concludes by the author's disposing of a possible *chronological* objection to Suetonius as a source of Plutarch, by showing that the *vita Ciceronis* was written later than 115 A.D., this year being the *terminus post quem* of the composition of the *Life of Sulla* (cf. ch. 21), which in its turn preceded Plutarch's *vita* of Demosthenes and Cicero, as Michaelis has convincingly proven. Suetonius' work must have been in the hands of the public long before this time, the author being then past the age of forty.

20. On the Use of Verbs of Saying in the Platonic Dialogues, by Dr. George B. Hussey, of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.³

This paper points out the various forms of verbs of saying used by Plato, and passes on to show that some of them belong exclusively to the later periods of his literary activity. The fact that almost all Plato's writings are in the form of dialogues suffices of itself to explain his frequent use of verbs of saying. Thus the *Protagoras* has 565 instances of them, and the *Phaedrus* over 320. Some of these

¹ Strange to say, it has never occurred to any one that Plutarch might possibly be indebted to Nepos' *Life of Cicero* (mentioned by Gellius XV, 28, 1) for some details. But cf. *Transactions*, Vol. XX. ² For the proof itself I refer to *Transac.* Vol. XX.

³ Published in full in *Am. Journ. Philol.* Vol. X.

verbs may depend for their use entirely on the external features of the dialogue. In the indirect dialogues — those where the argument is related to persons not present at it — the phrases $\eta\delta'$ *ds*, $\eta\nu\delta'$ *égw*, $\epsilon\phi\eta\nu$, $\epsilon\phi\eta$ make up the greater part of the verbs of saying.

If such verbs as belong to the narrative of the indirect dialogues are set aside, the remaining instances exhibit much more variety of form. They serve chiefly to introduce quotations of all sorts. So proverbs are usually introduced by $\tau\delta$ *λεγόμενον*, myths and traditions by *λέγεται*, and opinions of poets and philosophers by *λέγει*, *φησί*, or some other form in the active third person. Another use of these verbs of saying (and the one to which attention is especially called) occurs where one of the speakers quotes an earlier part of the dialogue he is engaged in, or even a preceding dialogue. When the statement referred to is near at hand or is quite prominent, a present tense, as *λέγεις*, *φής*, may be used in citing it, but when more distant a past tense *έλεγον*, *έρρήθη*, $\tau\alpha$ *λεχθέντα* is more frequent. It is among citations consisting of past passive forms that the gradual extension of use can be best observed. Some of them seem to be known only to Plato's later style, and by means of them the dialogues can be arranged in the following series, which probably corresponds somewhat closely with the order in which they were composed: —

	1. Total References.	2. Per cent of <i>έρρήθη</i> and <i>ρήθεις</i> .	3. Cases of <i>έρρήθη</i> and <i>ρήθεις</i> .	4. Cases of <i>έλέχθη</i> and <i>λεχθείς</i> .	5. Cases of <i>προερίθη</i> , <i>προερίπται</i> , and their Participles.	6. Cases of <i>λεχθείς</i> and <i>λεχθείσα</i> as an Adjective.	7. Cases of the Perfect Passive of <i>λέγω</i> .
Apology	7
Crito	11
Euthyphro.	10
Protagoras	26
Euthydemus	29
Laches	17
Charmides	18	1
Meno	16	1
Lysis	13	1
Parmenides	16	1
Cratylus	34	1	1
Hippias II	13	2	2
Republic (bks. I-V)	109	1.8	2	2	3
Gorgias	76	2.6	2	0	0
Phaedo	40	5.0	2	1	4
Symposium	29	6.9	2	1	1
Phaedrus	39	10.2	4	4	0
Republic (bks. VI-X)	80	8.7	7	3	9
Theaetetus	47	10.6	5	1	0
Sophist	65	9.2	6	7	1	1	..
Philebus	93	10.7	10	9	4	2	..
Timaeus	39	20.4	8	6	1	1	2
Politicus	88	26.1	23	11	2	5	1
Laws	324	11.1	36	26	5	10	3

	DITTENBERGER.	SCHANZ.
I.	Crito.	Apology.
	Euthyphro.	Euthyphro.
	Protagoras.	Gorgias.
	Charmides.	Laches.
	Laches.	Lysis.
	Hippias II.	Protagoras.
	Euthydemus.	Symposium.
	Meno.	Phaedo.
	Gorgias.	Phaedrus.
	Cratylus.	Cratylus.
	Phaedo.	Euthydemus.
	Symposium.	Theaetetus.
	Lysis.	epublic.
	Phaedrus.	Sophist.
II.	Republic.	Philebus.
	Theaetetus.	Politicus.
	Parmenides.	Timaeus.
	Philebus.	Laws.
	Sophist.	
	Politicus.	
	Laws.	

In determining the frequency of any form of citation in such different dialogues as the *Gorgias* and *Timaeus* the total number of references is a much fairer measure than the number of pages covered by each dialogue. These totals are shown in the first column of the table. They are made up solely of references to statements of persons engaged in the discussion, and are, besides, limited to past tenses of the indicative and to past participles of the verbs λέγω, ἐρῶ, εἶπον, and φημί. The tenses of the infinitive and imperative are omitted, as when used in a past tense they are not always references to a preceding passage. The second column shows what percentage of these citations is formed by ἐρρήθη and its participle ῥηθείς, and the third gives the absolute number of these special forms. The fourth column shows the cases of ἐλέχθη and λεχθείς when used as citations; and the next does the same for προερρήθη, προείρηται, and their participles. A peculiar and harsh construction of λεχθείς, as an adjective qualifying a noun of masculine or feminine gender, is shown in the sixth column. Cases of the rare perfect passive of λέγω are given in the last column. Some of these, however, are imperatives, and it should be remarked that the last two columns are not restricted to citations, but include all instances of the forms mentioned.

It will be seen that the first six dialogues do not show any of the forms given in the table. They can, therefore, only be put into a group by themselves; while their relations to one another within it have to be left undetermined. The next few dialogues in the series owe their position to the fact that they begin to show instances of ἐλέχθη. Then, when ἐρρήθη begins, it is chosen as a criterion; and finally the λεχθείς-construction, shown in the sixth column, becomes the test-word. Thus the early stages of each usage are considered to be most important, as it is then that the employment of the special word is most a matter of conscious effort. The columns containing προερρήθη and ἐλέκεται have, in general, a tendency to confirm the evidence of the others; but, except for this, are not of so much importance in fixing the order of the dialogues. The most natural explanation of these new forms of citation that appear in the later dialogues, but do not exclude

earlier words used for the same purpose, is that they were introduced for the sake of variety.

Dittenberger in *Hermes*, XVI, 321, and Schanz in the same periodical, XXI, 439, have already used a similar method of arranging the dialogues by means of changes in the use of words. Certain phrases containing *μήν* were used for this purpose by Dittenberger, and, except for the position of the *Lysis* and *Parmenides*, the present list agrees very closely with his results. According to his investigations the *Lysis* ought to be placed near the *Phaedrus* and the *Parmenides* near the *Philebus*. Their fluctuating position would thus seem to be another proof that they are not genuine Platonic dialogues.

21. The Quality of Sanskrit *a-kāra*, by Professor Edward W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. ; read by L. H. Elwell, Esq.

It seems to me time to put the formal question: Do we mean what we write when we transcribe the Sanskrit vowel usually rendered *a* by this symbol? As we know that there was a period in which the language had short *ǝ* and *ě* (of whatever source), and find neither of these represented in the alphabet; as we know also that there was a period when a single vowel sound represented all that was left of *ǝ*, *ě*, *ǝ*, we may for convenience' sake divide the growth of the whole language into two periods, Early and Late, approximately the time of the *Rig Veda* and of *Pāṇini* respectively.

For the early period we have (see Bloomfield in the third volume of the *Am. Journ.*), already given, the fact that short *ě* and *ǝ* existed. To the late period no such vowels were known. It is important to bear in mind that the alphabet arises between the two periods here designated.

One of the short vowels of the earlier period is *ǝ*, said to be developed from '*a*'s. As this *ǝ*, however, corresponds to the short *o* of related languages in *os*, it is evident that its apparent derivation from *as* assumes (what is in this case not yet proved) that we have here ('*a*'s) a real *a*, and not a letter subsequently to develop into '*a*'. The assumption of Oldenberg, that we have here *as* = *ǝ* = *au*, with a vanishing semivowel after the vowel, is based on examples that prove only the felt want of some sign to express the lost consonant which can have been nothing but *s*. The peculiar examples of '*a*'s = *ay* given Hymnen s. 457 show only a half-remembered consonant expressed, by analogy, by the semivowel; for there can be absolutely no historical sense in *apay isya*, *abhibhūyamānay iva*, etc. In *Indrō* '*braṇti* from *indrōs* + vowel '*a*' we have a result to be compared with *Indrō nāma*; the *s* lost before sonant and the following vowel absorbed in one case (compare the accent); in the other the *s* dropped before sonant, but the consciousness of the two consonants producing length of the preceding vowel. For until we know that in this example of '*a*'-*kāra* we are dealing with a pure '*a*' it is right to assume the vowel sound indicated, even were it probable that '*a*'*sdhi* would remain contracted as *ědhi*, while '*a*'*sti* is *ǝsti* (*ěsdhi* becomes *ědhi*, hence for *asti* read *ěsti*). Because the later alphabet gives us *s*'*a*'*d* we assume *sad* and take *sěd* to be contracted from *sasad* rather than *sěsěd*, though this alphabet on which we rest our belief does not really give us *sad*, as I shall now show, but *s* + doubtful vowel + *d* (I am aware that the primitive origin of *sěd*, etc., is called in question by Bar-

tholomae, but the example will serve as an illustration of our present transcription). Were it not for a future alphabet which writes \check{e} , \check{o} , \check{a} , in their further development with one sign (this which we write a and which I will call *akar*), we should not think of assuming that the \check{e} , \check{o} , \check{a} , of the Veda were all one sound as they actually become later. For if we prove \check{o} from 'a's and see no alphabetical distinction between \check{o} and \bar{o} , we may conclude that the alphabet is responsible for slurring other sounds also. It is then of the highest importance to know what *akar* is in the Sanskrit alphabet of the late period. Moreover, we are entitled to look to the neighboring dialects and see whether our alphabet is not later than the forms they give. In Pali our *akar* is represented by both \check{e} and \check{o} , and it is no explanation to say that this is the result of a later closed pronunciation of a (see Ind. Stud. iv. 119). Our ending of the plural verb *m'a's* is represented by *mũ*; the instrumental *rāj'a'bhis* by *ũbhi*, or *ēbhi*; *dharm'a's*, by *dhammō*; *pitrā*, by *pitarā* or *pitunā*; *j'a'y'a'ti* by *jetī*, etc. If we turn to Zend we find also, near as it stands to Sanskrit compared with other tongues, Sanskrit *akar* represented by \check{e} as well as by \check{a} ; the nominatives, as in Pali, *aspo*, *mano*; possibly the diphthong *oi* for *ai* (*toi*). It would be extraordinary to have Zend and Pali agree rather with Greek than with Sanskrit in giving o as the nom. sg. in *aspo*, etc. We write a for *akar* because the later alphabet demands — not a — but one vowel in all cases. What then is this vowel of the later period? Different vowels passed into one sound as in Greece. Three reasons show that in the second or late period this vowel was not an a . First, the oral tradition, that tradition which made the early Sanskrit scholars write not Manu but Menu, etc.; second, this traditional pronunciation is upheld by Pāṇini, at whose time we may loosely set the uniform stage, who says distinctly that the sound which he treats as open a is in reality a closed a . Now a closed a cannot be transcribed by a , but rather by \check{o} or \check{u} if we would render its quality correctly, and not violate truth by adherence to Pāṇini's self-confessed inaccuracy. Third, the Greek inscriptions show clearly that tradition and Pāṇini's confession bear witness to truth, for here we find that *akar*, far from being transcribed as a pure a , is rendered by Greek o , by ϵ , or even by i and u , as well as by a (see Weber's collection Ind. Ant. ii. 143 ff.). Now if we find the norm of a pure a earlier than Pāṇini (Vāj. Pr.), we may assume a chronological better than geographical difference, especially as the close a (\check{o} , \check{u}) seems to be found in various districts.

In this second period (to the beginning of which the alphabet must be referred) we find but one sign for the earlier \check{e} , \check{o} , \check{a} , and this sign is not really an a , but an \check{o} or \check{u} . What right have we, therefore, to insist on a pure a being the universal representative of this *akar* for the earlier period? Undoubtedly *akar* often represents a pure a because its later function embraces a pure a in a plurality of cases (as in words whose vowels = a , aj , etc.); but on the other hand, it often does not, as far as we can see; nor is there any reason to think so except given by this same alphabet. The separate existence of \check{e} , \check{o} , \check{a} , ceased before this alphabet began, becoming the "mid-back narrow a ," i.e. o in come, u in but. In transcribing *akar* by a we therefore fail to give rightly the sound of the second period, and ignore the fact that in the early period it would have been divided (had an alphabet existed) into \check{e} , \check{o} , \check{a} , which three vowels occur, but could of course leave no trace except by inference. Our norm for the early period must necessarily be doubtful in cases where no light is given from without. But where

a comparison of Zend, Pali, and Greek show *o* against an assumed Sanskrit 'a's, we ought certainly to make a distinction that is based on comparative forms and upheld by native texts; writing instead of *as*, *ās*: and we should probably not be wrong if we extended this distinct pronunciation into other cases where *ās* or *z̄s* can be predicated from native dialects in conjunction with Zend, itself nothing but an Aryan dialect a little further removed. But to keep on writing Sanskrit *a* = *o*, *ε*, *ο*, is certainly incorrect both for the early and the late period. In one case 'a' does not fill the requirements; in the other it contradicts a pronunciation that is proved to have been different. We might as well write *ε* = *i* in Greek because it came to be pronounced so in the course of centuries.

22. The Phonology of the Ionic Dialect, by Dr. Herbert Weir Smyth, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Though the Ionic dialect contains so generous a wealth of linguistic phenomena and stands in such intimate relations with the history of Hellenic thought, investigators have not yet taken possession of that precious legacy of opportunity bequeathed by Ahrens to his successors. A few scattered treatises dealing with Ionic is the total output of the half-century following upon the publication of the *De Graecae linguae dialectis*.

This paper gave a brief abstract of the results of a somewhat detailed examination of the vowel and the consonantal system of Ionic from the advent of the elegy to the period of the Sophistic Renaissance.

As to the field surveyed, so far as the inscriptions are concerned, I have endeavored to utilize every form pertinent to a knowledge of Ionic phonology. Whenever it was necessary to compare the date of any phonetic change in Ionic with the date of a similar change in Attic, I have drawn the latter dialect into the range of vision. Of the lyric poets, especial attention has been devoted to those of Ionic birth (Archilochos, Simonides Amorginus, Hipponax, Ananios, Kallinos, Mimnermos, Xenophanes, and Phokylides); and I have treated in detail the dialect of Tyrtaios, Solon, and Theognis: Tyrtaios, a Lakonian by adoption, but a representative of the early Ionic elegy; Solon, in order to test the question how far his Muse is Ionic, how far Old-Attic; and Theognis, that we may obtain a complete survey of the language of the elegy down to the end of the sixth century. Herodotos I have examined with special reference to the interrelation of the Mss., and trust that but few points have been overlooked, though I am but too well aware how difficult it is to reach completeness in so wide a field. For the language of the philosophers, Anaxagoras of Klazomenai, Diogenes of Apollonia, Melissos of Samos, Herakleitos of Ephesos, have been investigated; and for the older medical dialect, those writings of Hippokrates which are least open to the suspicion of spuriousness. Of the pseudo-Ionists, Aretaios' *Αἰτλαί*, Arrian's *Ἰνδική*, and Lukian's *Syrian Goddess* and *Astronomy*¹ are easily our chief sources; but I have placed under contribution the fragments of Abydenos' Assyrian History, Eusebios, and Eusebios Myndios, that we may realize the more vividly how persistent has been the influence exercised upon later prose by the Ionic dialect. The testimony of Gregory of Corinth has been adduced throughout.

¹ Even if the *Astronomy* should not prove to be the genuine work of Lukian, it is still invaluable as a testimony to the character of the pseudo-Ionism of the age of Hadrian.

From the point of view of the dialectologist, the history of Hellenic speech falls into four divisions: —

Period of primitive Greek.

Period of the life of single dialects.

Period of the contest of the Attic *κοινή* with the Doric *κοινή*.

Period of the existence of a universal *κοινή*.

Within the confines of the second period, Ionic is, broadly speaking, the dialect of the literary world from the eighth century until it was driven from its commanding position by Attic. Taken as a whole, Ionic presents in its structure a uniformity far more consistent than that possessed by Doric. It is upon the evidence of the inscriptions alone that we are enabled to assert the existence of subdivisions, which mark the course of Ionic emigration from the mainland of Greece. These sub-dialects are: I. Ionic of Eubœia and colonies. II. Ionic of the Kyklades. III. Ionic of Asia Minor and of the adjacent islands and their colonies.

I. WESTERN IONIC is the dialect of Eubœia and colonies (Chalkis, Kyme, Olynthos, Amphipolis, Eretria, Oropos, Styra). It still possesses the rough breathing; names derived from *κλέος* terminate in *-κλέης*, not in *-κλής*; the genitive of proper names whose second component part is an *-ι* stem, ends in *-ιδος*, not in *-ιος*. These peculiarities and certain others (*ει* < *ηι*, *οι* < *ωι*, and cases of *ττ* for *σσ*) testify to what an extent the political supremacy of Athens has succeeded in coloring the speech of the rear-guard of Ionism. When Western Ionic differs from the Ionic of the other divisions, it differs by its preference for Attic forms, save in its possession of rhotacism, found nowhere else upon Ionic territory, and whose ultimate provenance is still a matter of dispute. Another point of isolation is that Western Ionic alone produced no literature. Whatever artistic capacity the Eubœians possessed tended in the direction of the manufacture of vases.

II. ISLAND IONIC has *-κλής*, not *-κλέης*; *-ιος*, not *-ιδος*. Retaining the rough breathing, which is well attested in the case of the Parian Archilochos, Island Ionic thus forms a bridge between Western and Eastern Ionic. Up to the present time, no mint-marks of local difference can be observed in the speech of the various islands, and the sole ground for a separation into two sections, (1) Naxos, Keos; (2) Delos, Paros, Siphnos, is a difference in the writing of *η* = I.E. *ē* and *η* = I.E. *ā*. But at best this palaeographic distinction, which seems to betoken a difference in pronunciation, does not hold good for all time, having been retained a century longer by the first group than by the second.

III. The chief characteristic of EASTERN IONIC is the displacement of the rough breathing at a very early period. The inscriptions speak with no uncertain voice against the existence of the *spiritus asper* save in compounds; and literature confirms this testimony to a considerable extent. Asiatic Ionic, like that of the Kyklades, has *-κλής* and *-ιος*.

There doubtless existed sub-dialects of Eastern Ionic, but the accuracy of the Herodotean division is not yet attested by the monuments under our control.

The language of the inscriptions alone is not an absolute criterion of the genuineness of an Ionic form unless the inscription is older than 400 B.C. and contains no trace of what is specifically Attic. When the language of the inscriptions, with this limitation, agrees with that of the poets, we have the surest criterion of the

Ionic character of the form in question that is possible under the circumstances; and against this evidence the fluctuating orthography of Herodotean and Hippokratean Mss. can make no stand.

As in the domain of thought, so in that of language, the elegy occupies a different field from iambic poetry. Upon the dividing line of the frequency of adoption of Homeric forms, we may separate Theognis from the earlier elegists. In its possession of legacies from the earliest Ionic period, and in its use of Homeric Aiolisms, the dialect of the Megarian poet stands in closer touch with the language of the epic period than does the idiom of any of his predecessors of the elegiac guild.

Now there is a wide chasm between the Aiolisms of the earlier elegy and the adventitious Aiolisms of Chios. The latter are distinctively prose forms, the former are only such as had been consecrated to use by the epos. Here we must clearly grasp two facts: (1) that an elegiac poet could adopt only Homeric Aiolisms, and (2) that no elegiac poet, not of Ionic birth, could borrow from a genuine Ionian, forms that are specifically Ionic. Solon has his Atticisms, Tyrtaios and Theognis their Dorisms, but they may not use forms that are specifically Ionic. Our inscriptions show that what is not Homeric in the elegy is drawn from the soil whence the elegy sprang; and that the forms taken from the living speech of the poet's time are few in comparison to those found in iambic poetry.

If the language of the iambographers has but little love for archaic Ionisms, it has still less for Aiolisms. The language of Archilochos, Simonides of Amorgos, and Hipponax, is, with due allowance for the perverse influence of copyists who had the Attic norm in their mind's eye, practically the same as that of the inscriptions.

In great part the language of Herodotos is supported by that of the inscriptions, and much of what is genuine Ionic in Herodotos is also Attic. Many forms which occur nowhere else outside of Herodotos find an easy explanation in the laws of Greek morphology. Of the remaining forms, aside from the out-and-out barbarisms, one part was obsolescent, another, and the larger part, obsolete, at the time the genius of the Ionic race created literary prose.

In the course of the following investigation my primary purpose has been to let the facts themselves show how great is the difference existing between what is certainly Ionic of the fifth century and what is ordinarily proclaimed as Ionic of the fifth century upon the authority of Herodotean Mss. While I do not deny that Herodotos may have adopted forms that are specifically Homeric in passages that are strongly tinged with an epic tone, nevertheless my survey of the evidence has led me to the conclusion that the original text of Herodotos was written in the dialect of his time, while the bulk of the variations from that dialect is due to a *μεταχαρακτηρισμός*, which I would place about the first century of our era.

In the history of Greek literature *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* proceeded on two lines: either in the direction of Atticizing the dialect texts, a fact vouched for by Galen as usual in his time, or in the direction of the substitution of dialect forms in the light of contemporaneous dialectological theories. The text of Alkman, of Korinna, and, to a lesser extent, that of Pindar, bear witness to the activity of the *μεταγραφόμενοι* in the latter direction.

The writers of the Hadrianic age who imitated Herodotos and Hippokrates have received the full shock of this wave of speculation as regards Ionic. But

from the point of view of higher criticism, the "pseudo-Ionisms" of Lukian and Aretaios are on a different footing from the same forms in Stein's or Holder's text of Herodotos. In the one case they are the result of genuine imitation; in the other, these forms never existed in Herodotos.

A further estrangement from genuine Ionic was produced by the occasional insertion of such hyper-Ionic formation into the texts of these Ionists as are not found save in some Mss. of Herodotos.

One of the causes of this *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* was the inability of the dialectologists to distinguish between the Ionic of the Homeric period and the Ionic of the fifth century. It was all Ionic Greek to these sciolists. The cardinal error of the *μεταγραφόμενοι* was the foisting of uncontracted forms upon Herodotos. This was caused by inability to distinguish between those vocalic combinations that normally remained uncontracted and those which by the fifth century had suffered contraction, and by their failing to recognize that *εο* and *εω*, even if written in the uncontracted form, had frequently become diphthongal as early as the seventh century. Evidence is adduced that this *μεταχαρακτηρισμός* has not affected alike all the early writers in Ionic, and that upon the authority of good Mss. the original form may very often be reinstated.

23. The Enchantment of "Grammar," by Dr. C. P. G. Scott, of New York, N. Y.

In the absence of the author, the following paper was read by title :—

24. Sex-Denoting Nouns in American Languages, by Albert S. Gatschet, Esq., of the United States Bureau of Ethnology, Washington, D. C.

When primitive populations attempt to form grammatic distinctions of the objects which they see around themselves, they usually classify them into objects of the animate and objects of the inanimate order. Whether this distinction is made by adding a syllable or retrenching one, there is probably no language on the face of the earth that does not show some trace of this obvious and antique classification. It appears to have manifested itself at first in the pronominal parts of speech and from there spread into the verb and the noun. The various phases and aspects of this classifying process are also known to students of American languages as rational and irrational, noble and ignoble, arrhenic and metarrhenic, etc., as far as the noun is concerned, and are of great psychologic interest; the Algonkin dialects of the United States and Canada exhibit this distinction in a very obvious manner.

But besides the above, a distinction of sex was made in some languages, which either embraced all the objects of the animal creation or only the more important ones, viz. : persons, quadrupeds, and birds, the other animates being not distinguished for sex and relegated to the inanimate class. Abstract nouns adopted either the feminine or the inanimate gender.

The personal pronoun, especially the third person, is that part of speech where sex is *first* marked by separate grammatic signs, and from there it works its way

into the other pronouns. Sex may be denoted in *one* dialect of a linguistic family and not be distinguished in the others, as I have observed in the Kalapuya of Oregon. It exists in the pronoun of the third person in some Iroquois dialects, but not in the Cherokee, which is a cognate language. Even in Iroquois dialects it extends to persons only, not to animals. A beginning of sex-distinction is found in the pronoun of the Selish and Chinook dialects, in Yuchi and in Timucua, where *o*, *oqe* is *he*, *ya* : *she*. The large majority of American languages knows nothing of any such pronominal distinction; we do not find it in the Shoshonian, Algonkin, Maskoki, Kechua, and Tupi languages.

Sex-distinction is scarcer still in the *verb* of American languages than in the pronoun, though it could have easily made its way into this part of speech, wherever there is a real personal inflection or incorporation of the object into the verb. Something of the sort is observed in the verb of Chinook, at least in Klakamas, which is an Upper Chinook dialect I had the opportunity to study.

The *substantive* has resisted more than other parts of speech the adoption of formative affixes designating sex, and in most American languages such are wanting. In Maya dialects the appositions "male" and "female" have been ground down so as to represent mere prefixes, *ah-* for the male, *ish-*, *sh-*, for the female. A beginning of personification of inanimate objects in regard to sex is found in a few Indian terms. Thus, *Mississippi river* is called in Caddo: Báhat-sássin, the "Mother of rivers"; and *thumb* is in all the Maskoki dialects "of one's fingers their mother"; in Chicasa, ílbak íshke.

In the eastern hemisphere two stocks serve as examples of a well-developed system of sex-distinction: the Aryan and the Semito-Hamitic. In the former we find a large variety of modifications in this line, one of these being the total extinction of the neuter gender, which formerly represented the inanimate class, by the masculine and feminine in some of the *modern* dialects. In America sex-distinction in the noun has been found to occur only in two families, the Carib and the Tunica; but when a more profound study of all the American tongues will have been achieved, it may turn up in other languages also.

In the Carib family, the real seat of which is in South America, sex-denoting affixes have been studied in the Arowak, the Goajiro, and the Kalinago of the West Indies or Antillian islands. From Fr. Müller, *Grundriss* (vol. II), I quote the following instances of sex-inflection:

<i>Arowak</i> :	basabanti <i>boy</i> ,	basabantu, <i>girl</i> .
	kansiti <i>loving</i> (man),	kansitu <i>loving</i> (woman).
	elontu <i>male child</i> ,	elontu <i>female child</i> .
<i>Goajiro</i> :	anashi <i>good</i> ,	fem. anase.
	oikari <i>merchant</i> ,	fem. okare.
	maɣuaɪntchi <i>sorry</i> ,	fem. maɣuaɪnre.
<i>Kalinago</i> :	aparuti <i>murderer</i> ,	fem. aparutu.
	ki ⁿ shi ⁿ ti <i>beloved</i> ,	fem. ki ⁿ shi ⁿ tu.

These examples prove that the sex-suffixes extend over the adjective and participle, as well as over the substantive.

Sex-suffixes appear also in the *Taensa* language of Louisiana; but since this language is subject to some doubts of genuineness in the form as we have it now,

we have to remit the discussion over its sex-character to some future day. It is at all events a curious fact, that sex-suffixes appear here *in such close vicinity* to the Tunica, another language of Eastern Louisiana, *both* showing them in the *second* as well as in the *third* persons of the personal and possessive pronoun.

The *Tunica* or Tunixka, discovered by me in the autumn of 1886, proved to represent a family heretofore unknown to science, and on account of its strange peculiarities deserves to be carefully studied and compared with other languages, especially with those once spoken in its immediate neighborhood, as Nā'htchi, Maskóki, Atákapa, and Shetimásha.

The masculine and feminine are the only genders existing in Tunica, for all inanimate objects belong to one of these two, and abstract nouns are of the feminine gender.

In nouns the masculine is marked in the singular by a prefix uk-, u-, or by a suffix -ku, -χku; the feminine by a prefix tik-, t'h-, ti-, t-, or by a suffix -χtchi, -ktchi, -'htchi, -'htch, -tch, -ts. In the plural, the masculine nouns are made distinct by a prefix sik-, sig-, the feminine by sin-, siⁿ-, si-; these plural affixes appear also, but in rare instances only, as suffixes. These affixes are often dropped, but the feminine less frequently than the masculine affixes.

That these affixes are of a pronominal character and that some appear also as independent personal pronouns, may be gathered from the following table of pronouns:

íma	I, ímata ⁿ	myself.
ma	thou (masc.), há'ma	(fem.).
úwi	he, t'í'htchi	she; emphatic: úwita ⁿ himself, etc.
ínima	we, iníma ⁿ	ourselves.
wínima	ye (masc.), hínima	(fem.).
sā'nma, sā'n	they (masc.), sínima, sín	they (fem.).

The possessive pronouns are prefixed to the noun, and most of them are abbreviations from the above through retrenchment of -ma.

In the verb, the subject-pronoun is incorporated into its stem as a suffix of one or two syllables, which largely differs from the personal pronoun as quoted above.

In the sentence these suffixes appear as follows: —

kuá túχku óshka tádsara *the claws of a little bird*. Kuá *bird* being masculine, túχku or túχk, from tú *small*, assumes the suffix of that gender.

tóni sik'háyi *old people*, lit. "people — those — old."

tá rixkéku hária tá ri'tch atapá'ra *the tree is as tall as the house*, lit. "the tree — he tall the house — her equals." Tá is the article *the*, which is unchangeable as in English; rixku means *tree*, ri *house*.

táχtchiksh t'í'hkorak *full moon*, lit. "lunary she — round"; kóra meaning *round*.

As instances of the changes which adjectives are undergoing when subjected to the sex-denoting process and accompanied by their substantives, we offer the following: —

tā'n	great, large,	masc. tā'ku, tā'gu,	fem. tā'htchi.
méli	black,	méliku, mélixku,	méliktchi.
rówa	white,	rówaku,	rówaktch(i).
máka ⁿ	fat,	makáχku,	maká'htchi.
táχkir	smutty,	táχkirku,	táχkiri'htch.

Substantives standing alone or accompanied by adjectives, numerals, participles, etc., do not always assume the prefix or suffix of their particular gender; there are special laws or rules presiding over this.

Masculines are all the nouns designating male persons, male relationships, male occupations; all animals, the higher and the lower, unless they are specially pointed out as of the female sex; all plants, trees, bushes, and weeds. Thus we have: óni *man*, kútuhuk *son*, íχtchaku *my grandfather*, kíwa *weasel*, híχku *mouse*, shími *pigeon*, ná-araⁿ *snake*, níni *fish*, takírka *mollusk*, ríχku *tree*, ráyi *mulberry tree*, tápa *plant*.

Feminines are all the nouns designating female persons, occupations, and relationships, the celestial bodies, seasons and natural phenomena, the earth and its parts, the parts of the compass, the names of diseases and the abstract nouns. Examples: núχtchi *woman*, éχkutu wálikth *my stepdaughter*, táχtchi *sun*, táχsaba *winter*, tihikash *south*, íni yi *toothache*, káχshi *truth*.

About equally divided between both genders are the substantives which designate the parts and limbs of the human and animal body and of plants, and the objects of manufacture; it is difficult to decide which is the principle assigning these nouns to the one or the other category. Thus hássáⁿ *saw*, tchúhi *pillow*, wúχku *hat*, éruk *my neck*, úyuⁿ *bowels*, are masculines, while to the opposite gender belong nouns like: rí *house*, lodge, röhina *book*, *paper*, yúnka *rope*, ópushka *lung*, táχkishi *skin* and *bark* of plants.

I conclude this article with the remark that no language has ever been discovered upon the western continent which thus individualizes all the animate beings and inanimate objects as to sex, and does it with such a poetic, creative power, as Tunica.

The Association adjourned at 12.30 P. M.

The Secretary desires to state that all contributions of new words, of which a list was published in Vol. XIX. pp. 80-82, should be arranged upon the lines laid down by the sub-committee which edits the material furnished, viz.: all new words should be accompanied by the names of their authors so far as known, the place of their occurrence (page, etc.), the date of the issue of the book or journal in which they are contained, and the context of the sentence so far as is necessary to elucidate the meaning of the word. Communications may be addressed to the Secretary.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1889-90.

PRESIDENT.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

JULIUS SACHS.

JOHN H. WRIGHT.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

TREASURER.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and —

MARTIN L. D'OOGHE.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

FRANCIS A. MARCH.

BERNADOTTE PERRIN.

WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.¹

1889-'90.

F. F. Abbott, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. W. Abernethy, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Cyrus Adler, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Charles A. Aiken, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Frederic D. Allen, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
George Gillespie Allen, Boston, Mass.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.
Louis F. Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington.
Robert Arrowsmith, Barnard School, St. Paul, Minn.
Sidney G. Ashmore, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Charles W. Bain, Portsmouth, Va.
H. L. Baker, Detroit, Mich. (70 Griswold St.).
C. W. Ballard, 132 Franklin St., New York City.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Timothy J. Barrett, Boston College, Boston, Mass.
William M. Baskerville, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Isbon T. Beckwith, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
A. J. Bell, Victoria College, Cobourg, Ont.
George Bendelari, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles E. Bennett, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (314 Mills St.).
T. S. Bettens, "The Kensington," cor. Fifty-seventh St. and Fourth Ave.,
New York, N. Y.
Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
P. M. Biklé, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
George H. Bingham, Pinkerton Academy, Derry, N. H.
E. C. Bissell, Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. (10 Garden St.).
Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
C. W. E. Body, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont.
Charles Frederic Bradley, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
F. P. Brent, Onancock, Va.

¹ This list has been corrected up to Feb. 1, 1890; permanent addresses are given, as far as may be. Names where the residence is left blank are either of members who are in Europe, or of those whose addresses are not known to the Secretary.

Fisk P. Brewer, Grinnell, Ia.
Josiah Bridge, New York, N. Y. (69 West Forty-eighth St.).
Le Baron R. Briggs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Frank M. Bronson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Jabez Brooks, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (1708 Laurel Ave.).
Walter H. Buell, Scranton, Pa. (243 Jefferson Ave.).
Sylvester Burnham, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Henry F. Burton, Univ. of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (63 East Ave.).
Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
Edward Capps, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
William H. Carpenter, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Franklin Carter, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Clarence F. Castle, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Charles Chandler, Denison University, Granville, O.
Eva Channing, Forest Hill St., Jamaica Plain, Mass.
A. C. Chapin, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), 108 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Frank A. Christie.
Bradbury L. Cilley, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Kate Holladay Claghorn, Bryn Mawr College.
Edward B. Clapp, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.
Henry Clarke, 121 Elgin Crescent, Notting Hill, London W., England.
Henry A. Coit, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
W. C. Collar, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass.
Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
William T. Colville, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
Richard S. Colwell, Denison University, Granville, O.
David Y. Comstock, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Albert S. Cook, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Oscar H. Cooper, Austin, Tex.
William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Edward G. Coy, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Howard Crosby, New York, N. Y. (116 East Nineteenth St.).
John M. Cross, Kingston, N. Y.
John M. Crow, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Ia.
W. S. Currell, Davidson College, N. C.
Samuel Ives Curtiss, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
William L. Cushing, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Sanford L. Cutler, Hatfield Academy, Hatfield, Mass.
C. T. Davis, Packer Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Schele De Vere, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
Francis B. Denio, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

- Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Manuel J. Drennan, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 Morton W. Easton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
 T. T. Eaton, Louisville, Ky.
 William Wells Eaton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
 Thomas H. Eckfeldt, Friends' School, New Bedford, Mass.
 August Hjalmar Edgren, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
 Howard Edwards, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
 James C. Egbert, Jr., Columbia College, New York.
 Arthur M. Elliott, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
 L. H. Elwell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 Joseph Emerson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
 Carl W. Ernst, *The Beacon*, Boston, Mass.
 Arthur Fairbanks.
 H. R. Fairclough, University College, Toronto, Ont.
 Charles E. Fay, Tufts College, College Hill, Mass.
 Edwin W. Fay, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
 E. G. Ferguson, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill.
 O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
 Mrs. G. W. Field, 204 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Isaac Flagg, Westville, Conn.
 John Fletcher, Queen's College, Kingston, Ont.
 O. O. Fletcher, Springfield, Ill. (206 Capitol Avenue).
 Carlton A. Foote, Latin School, Atkinson, Kans.
 Harold N. Fowler, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
 A. L. Fuller, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
 William Gallagher, Williston Seminary, East Hampton, Mass.
 Paul C. Gandolfo, St. Louis, Mo. (3102 Clark Ave.).
 James M. Garnett, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
 George P. Garrison, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
 Albert S. Gatschet, United States Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
 Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 F. B. Goddard, Malden, Mass.
 Julius Goebel, *Belletristisches Journal*, New York, N. Y. (P. O. Box 3595).
 Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 Horace Goodhue, Jr., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
 Ralph L. Goodrich, U. S. Courts, Little Rock, Ark.
 Abby M. Goodwin, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Richard J. H. Gottheil, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
 James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Lee L. Grumbine, Lebanon, Pa.

- A. Gudeman, 40 East Sixty-ninth St., New York City.
William Gardner Hale, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Arthur P. Hall, Drury College, Springfield, Mo.
Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum, Central Park, New York, N. Y.
J. Leslie Hall, William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.
Randall C. Hall, General Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Charles S. Halsey, Union Classical Institute, Schenectady, N. Y.
William McD. Halsey, New York, N. Y. (34 West Fortieth St.).
B. F. Harding, Belmont School, Cambridge, Mass.
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
William R. Harper, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. Rendel Harris, Haverford College, Pa.
Caskie Harrison, Latin School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Montague St.).
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Paul Haupt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Edward Southworth Hawes, Cathedral School of St. Paul, Garden City, N. Y.
C. R. Hemphill, 817 Second St., Louisville, Ky.
Theophilus Heness, 142 Crown St., New Haven, Conn.
W. T. Hewett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.
Hermann V. Hilprecht, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Horace A. Hoffman, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Addison Hogue, University of Mississippi, Oxford, Miss.
Edward W. Hopkins, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
William Houston, Toronto, Can.
L. C. Hull, Lawrenceville, N. J.
E. R. Humphreys, Hotel Westland, Boston, Mass.
Milton W. Humphreys, University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va.
W. I. Hunt, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George B. Hussey, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Edmund Morris Hyde, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
Andrew Ingraham, Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass.
A. V. W. Jackson, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (Highland Ave.,
Yonkers, N. Y.).
Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Morris Jastrow, Jr., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Henry Johnson, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry C. Johnson, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
John Johnson, Dalhousie College, Halifax, N. S.
Thomas M. Johnson, Editor of *The Platonist*, Osceola, Mo.
R. V. Jones, Arcadia College, Wolfeville, N. S.
Thomas W. Jordan, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va.
Robert P. Keep, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
Martin Kellogg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

- Alexander Kerr, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.
J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.
William A. Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lewis H. Lapham, 68 Gold St., New York, N. Y.
C. W. Larned, U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
William Cranston Lawton, Cambridge, Mass.
Abby Leach, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
M. D. Learned, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
J. T. Lees, Lincoln, Nebraska.
R. F. Leighton, Gloucester, Mass.
John M. Leonard, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
Thomas B. Lindsay, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
Gonzalez Lodge, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Charles Louis Loos, Kentucky University, Lexington, Ky.
Frances E. Lord, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
George D. Lord, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Jules Luquiens, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
Frederick Lutz, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Francis A. March, Jr., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Samuel A. Martin, Lincoln University, Lincoln University P. O., Pa.
Winfred R. Martin.
Ellen F. Mason, Newport, R. I.
R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
B. C. Matthews, Newark, N. J. (58 Lincoln Ave.).
W. Gordon McCabe, University School, Petersburg, Va.
J. J. McCook, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
George F. McKibben, Denison University, Granville, O.
Harriet E. McKinstry, Lake Erie Female Seminary, Painesville, O.
H. Z. McLain, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind.
George McMillan, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Elmer T. Merrill, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
William A. Merrill, Miami University, Oxford, O.
Charles A. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Clifford H. Moore, Oakland, Cal.
Frank G. Moore, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George F. Moore, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
J. L. Moore, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Morris H. Morgan, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Edward P. Morris, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
John Robert Moses, Rugby Academy, Philadelphia, Pa. (3208 Race St.).
Wilfred H. Munro, 132 Benefit Street, Providence, R. I.
Augustus T. Murray, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
Francis Philip Nash, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
C. K. Nelson, Brookeville Academy, Brookeville, Md.
James King Newton, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
Frank W. Nicolson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Marston Niles, 155 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Ransom Norton, Houlton, Me.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
Arthur H. Palmer, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (750 Republic St.).
Charles P. Parker, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry E. Parker, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
E. G. Parsons, Derry, N. H.
James C. Parsons, Prospect Hill School, Greenfield, Mass.
Richard Parsons, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O.
James M. Paton, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
Endicott Peabody, Groton School, Groton, Mass.
Calvin W. Pearson, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Ernest M. Pease, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Henry T. Peck, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Tracy Peck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (124 High St.).
Bernadotte Perrin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (837 Case Ave.).
Edward D. Perry, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Edward E. Phillips, Marietta College, Marietta, O.
W. H. P. Phyfe, 12 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y.
Edwin M. Pickop, Hartford, Conn.
William T. Piper, Cambridge, Mass. (179 Brattle St.).
Samuel B. Platner, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O.
William Carey Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (7 Cooke St.).
Louis Pollens, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.
William Porter, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
L. S. Potwin, Adelbert College, Cleveland, O. (2108 Euclid Ave.).
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.
Henry Preble, Rome, Italy (Baring Brothers).
George Prentice, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Thomas R. Price, Columbia College, New York, N. Y. (212 Second Ave.).
Sylvester Primer, Friends' School, Providence, R. I.
Louis Dwight Ray, 2125 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky.

- Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
George M. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Rufus B. Richardson, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
Arthur W. Roberts, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Harley F. Roberts, Free Academy, Norwich, Conn.
David H. Robinson, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
William A. Robinson, Lehigh University, So. Bethlehem, Pa.
F. E. Rockwood, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
George Rodemann, Cambridge, Mass.
Martin Luther Rouse, Douglasville, Ga.
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
Samuel G. Sanders, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex.
Thomas F. Sanford, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Wesley C. Sawyer, University of Pacific, College Park, Cal.
W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O.
Henry Schliemann, Athens, Greece.
C. P. G. Scott, 76 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
Henry A. Scribner, Plainfield, N. J.
Charles D. Seely, State Normal School, Brockport, N. Y.
William J. Seelye, Parsons College, Fairfield, Ia.
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (112 College St.).
Charles C. Shackford, Brookline, Mass. (4 Walnut Terrace).
Robert Sharp, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.
Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
James P. Sheraton, Wycliffe College, Toronto, Ont.
William D. Shipman, Buchtel College, Akron, O.
Paul Shorey, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Henry A. Short, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.
Helen W. Shute, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
Carl Siedhof, Jr., 32 West Cedar St., Boston, Mass.
E. G. Sihler, Classical School, 38 West Fifty-ninth St., New York, N. Y.
M. S. Slaughter, Iowa College, Grinnell, Ia.
Charles Foster Smith, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
Clement Lawrence Smith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Frank Webster Smith, State Normal School, Westfield, Mass.
Josiah R. Smith, Ohio State University, Columbus, O.
Richard M. Smith, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
Albert H. Smyth, Philadelphia, Pa.
Herbert Weir Smyth, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Edward Snyder, University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.
George C. S. Southworth, Salem, O.
Edward H. Spieker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Jonathan Y. Stanton, Bates College, Lewiston, Me.

- M. Wilson Sterling, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
J. R. S. Sterrett, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Austin Stickney, 35 West Seventeenth St., New York, N. Y.
Morris H. Stratton, Salem, N. J.
J. J. Stürzinger, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
F. C. Sumichrast, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Charles W. Super, Ohio University, Athens, O.
Frank B. Tarbell, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Franklin Taylor, High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (629 North Twelfth St.).
John Phelps Taylor, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
John Tetlow, Girls' High School, Boston, Mass.
J. Henry Thayer, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (67 Sparks St.).
William E. Thompson, Hamline University, Hamline, Minn.
Fitz Gerald Tisdall, College of the City of New York ("The Chelsea," 222 West Twenty-third St.), N. Y.
Edward M. Tomlinson, Alfred University, Alfred Centre, N. Y.
Henry A. Todd, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
H. C. Tolman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
James A. Towle, Robbins School, Norfolk, Conn.
James R. Truax, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Alfred C. True, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
James S. Trueman, Alleghany College, Alleghany, Pa.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
Frank L. Van Cleef, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany.
Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
J. W. H. Walden, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Hamilton Wallace, Public High School, Tulare, Cal.
Benjamin B. Warfield, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Frederick M. Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Henry C. Warren, 67 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William E. Waters, Hughes High School, Cincinnati, O.
Benjamin W. Wells.
Andrew F. West, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
J. B. Weston, Christian Biblical Institute, Standfordville, N. Y.
L. K. Wharton, Liberty, Va.
A. S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
Benjamin I. Wheeler, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
James R. Wheeler, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
Horatio Stevens White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
John Williams White, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Henry Whitehorne, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
J. Ernest Whitney, Colorado Springs, Col.

William Dwight Whitney, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 Mills Whittlesey, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
 Alexander M. Wilcox, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
 Charles R. Williams, Associated Press, New York, N. Y.
 S. Ross Winans, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
 E. Lincoln Wood, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
 Henry Wood, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 W. G. Woodfin, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
 Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
 Charles Baker Wright, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.
 Henry P. Wright, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (128 York St.).
 John Henry Wright, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (14 Avon St.).
 Sarah E. Wright, Augusta Female Seminary, Staunton, Va.
 A. C. Zenos, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

[Number of Members, 356.]

THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS (ALPHABETIZED BY TOWN)
 SUBSCRIBE FOR THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Akron, O.: Buchtel College Library.
 Albany, N. Y.: N. Y. State Library (Care of Albany News Co., 508
 Broadway, Albany).
 Amherst, Mass.: Amherst College Library.
 Andover, Mass.: Phillips Academy Library.
 Andover, Mass.: Theological Seminary Library.
 Ann Arbor, Mich.: Michigan University Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Library.
 Baltimore, Md.: Peabody Institute.
 Berea, Madison Co., Ky.: Berea College Library.
 Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Library.
 Boston, Mass.: Boston Athenæum.
 Boston, Mass.: Boston Public Library.
 Brooklyn, N. Y.: The Brooklyn Library.
 Brunswick, Me.: Bowdoin College Library.
 Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Bryn Mawr College Library.
 Buffalo, N. Y.: The Buffalo Library.
 Burlington, Vt.: Library of University of Vermont.
 Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library.
 Champaign, Ill.: University of Illinois Library.
 Chicago, Ill.: Public Library.
 Cleveland, O.: Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.
 College Hill, Mass.: Tufts College Library.
 Columbus, O.: Ohio State University Library.

Crawfordsville, Ind. : Wabash College Library.
Detroit, Mich. : Public Library.
Easton, Pa. : Lafayette College Library.
Evanston, Ill. : Northwestern University Library.
Gambier, O. : Kenyon College Library.
Geneva, N. Y. : Hobart College Library.
Greencastle, Ind. : De Pauw University Library.
Hanover, N. H. : Dartmouth College Library.
Ithaca, N. Y. : Cornell University Library.
Lincoln, Neb. : Library of State University of Nebraska.
Marietta, O. : Marietta College Library.
Middletown, Conn. : Wesleyan University Library.
Milwaukee, Wis. : Public Library.
Minneapolis, Minn. : Athenæum Library.
Nashville, Tenn. : Vanderbilt University Library.
Newton Centre, Mass. : Library of Newton Theological Institution.
New York, N. Y. : Astor Library.
New York, N. Y. : Library of Columbia College.
New York, N. Y. : Library of The College of the City of New York (Lexington Ave. and Twenty-third St.).
New York, N. Y. : Union Theological Seminary Library (1200 Park Ave.).
Olivet, Eaton Co., Mich. : Olivet College Library.
Philadelphia, Pa. : American Philosophical Society.
Philadelphia, Pa. : The Library Company of Philadelphia.
Philadelphia, Pa. : The Mercantile Library.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y. : Vassar College Library.
Providence, R. I. : Brown University Library.
Rochester, N. Y. : Rochester University Library.
Springfield, Mass. : City Library.
Tokio, Japan : Library of Imperial University.
University of Virginia, Albemarle Co., Va. : University Library.
Washington, D. C. : Library of Congress.
Washington, D. C. : United States Bureau of Education.
Waterville, Me. : Colby University Library.
Wellesley, Mass. : Wellesley College Library.
Worcester, Mass. : Free Public Library.

[Number of subscribing institutions, 58.]

TO THE FOLLOWING LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS HAVE BEEN SENT COMPLETE
SETS (VOLUMES I.-XVIII.) OF THE TRANSACTIONS, GRATIS.

American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece.
British Museum, London, England.
Royal Asiatic Society, London.

Philological Society, London.
 Society of Biblical Archæology, London.
 India Office Library, London.
 Bodleian Library, Oxford.
 Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, Scotland.
 Trinity College Library, Dublin, Ireland.
 Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
 Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Shanghai.
 Japan Asiatic Society, Yokohama.
 Public Library of Victoria, Melbourne, Australia.
 Sir George Grey's Library, Cape Town, Africa.
 Reykjavik College Library, Iceland.
 University of Christiana, Norway.
 University of Upsala, Sweden.
 Russian Imperial Academy, St. Petersburg.
 Austrian Imperial Academy, Vienna.
 Anthropologische Gesellschaft, Vienna.
 Biblioteca Nazionale, Florence, Italy.
 Reale Accademia delle Scienze, Turin.
 Société Asiatique, Paris, France.
 Athénée Oriental, Louvain, Belgium.
 Curatorium of the University, Leyden, Holland.
 Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia, Java.
 Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, Berlin, Germany.
 Royal Saxon Society of Sciences, Leipsic.
 Royal Bavarian Academy of Sciences, Munich.
 Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Halle.
 Library of the University of Bonn.
 Library of the University of Jena.
 Library of the University of Königsberg.
 Library of the University of Leipsic.
 Library of the University of Tübingen.
 Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.

[Number of foreign Institutions, 36.]

[Total, (356 + 58 + 36 + 1 =) 451.]

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT.

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS.

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS.

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS.

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.
2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.
3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES.

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.
2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS.

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

THE annually published "Proceedings" of the American Philological Association contain an account of the doings at the annual meeting, brief abstracts of the papers read, reports upon the progress of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published "Transactions" give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The Proceedings are bound with them as an Appendix.

The following tables show the authors and contents of the first eighteen volumes of Transactions:—

1869-1870. — Volume I.

- Hadley, J.: On the nature and theory of the Greek accent.
Whitney, W. D.: On the nature and designation of the accent in Sanskrit.
Goodwin, W. W.: On the aorist subjunctive and future indicative with *ἔπαις* and *οὐ μή*.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the best method of studying the North American languages.
Haldeman, S. S.: On the German vernacular of Pennsylvania.
Whitney, W. D.: On the present condition of the question as to the origin of language.
Lounsbury, T. R.: On certain forms of the English verb which were used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
Trumbull, J. Hammond: On some mistaken notions of Algonkin grammar, and on mistranslations of words from Eliot's Bible, etc.
Van Name, A.: Contributions to Creole Grammar.
Proceedings of the preliminary meeting (New York, 1868), of the first annual session (Poughkeepsie, 1869), and of the second annual session (Rochester, 1870).

1871. — Volume II.

- Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.
Allen, F. D.: On the so-called Attic second declension.
Whitney, W. D.: Strictures on the views of August Schleicher respecting the nature of language and kindred subjects.
Hadley, J.: On English vowel quantity in the thirteenth century and in the nineteenth.
March, F. A.: Anglo-Saxon and Early English pronunciation.
Bristed, C. A.: Some notes on Ellis's Early English Pronunciation.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On Algonkin names for man.

Greenough, J. B.: On some forms of conditional sentences in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.

Proceedings of the third annual session, New Haven, 1871.

1872. — Volume III.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Words derived from Indian languages of North America.

Hadley, J.: On the Byzantine Greek pronunciation of the tenth century, as illustrated by a manuscript in the Bodleian Library.

Stevens, W. A.: On the substantive use of the Greek participle.

Bristed, C. A.: Erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *suck*.

Hart, C. F.: Notes on the Lingoa Geral, or Modern Tupi of the Amazonas.

Whitney, W. D.: On material and form in language.

March, F. A.: Is there an Anglo-Saxon language?

March, F. A.: On some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: Notes on forty versions of the Lord's Prayer in Algonkin languages.

Proceedings of the fourth annual session, Providence, 1872.

1873. — Volume IV.

Allen, F. D.: The Epic forms of verbs in *daw*.

Evans, E. W.: Studies in Cymric philology.

Hadley, J.: On Koch's treatment of the Celtic element in English.

Haldeman, S. S.: On the pronunciation of Latin, as presented in several recent grammars.

Packard, L. R.: On some points in the life of Thucydides.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the classification of conditional sentences in Greek syntax.

March, F. A.: Recent discussions of Grimm's law.

Lull, E. P.: Vocabulary of the language of the Indians of San Blas and Caledonia Bay, Darien.

Proceedings of the fifth annual session, Easton, 1873.

1874. — Volume V.

Tyler, W. S.: On the prepositions in the Homeric poems.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English vowel-mutation, present in *cag*, *keg*.

Packard, L. R.: On a passage in Homer's *Odyssey* (λ 81-86).

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On numerals in American Indian languages, and the Indian mode of counting.

Sewall, J. B.: On the distinction between the subjunctive and optatives modes in Greek conditional sentences.

Morris, C. D.: On the age of Xenophon at the time of the *Anabasis*.

Whitney, W. D.: *φύσει* or *θέσει* — natural or conventional?

Proceedings of the sixth annual session, Hartford, 1874.

1875. — Volume VI.

Harkness, A.: On the formation of the tenses for completed action in the Latin finite verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On an English consonant-mutation, present in *proof*, *prove*.

Carter, F.: On Begemann's views as to the weak preterit of the Germanic verbs.

Morris, C. D.: On some forms of Greek conditional sentences.

Williams, A.: On verb-reduplication as a means of expressing completed action.

Sherman, L. A.: A grammatical analysis of the Old English poem "The Owl and the Nightingale."

Proceedings of the seventh annual session, Newport, 1875.

1876. — Volume VII.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: On *εἰ* with the future indicative and *ἐάν* with the subjunctive in the tragic poets.

Packard, L. R.: On Grote's theory of the structure of the Iliad.

Humphreys, M. W.: On negative commands in Greek.

Toy, C. H.: On Hebrew verb-etymology.

Whitney, W. D.: A botanico-philological problem.

Goodwin, W. W.: On *shall* and *should* in protasis, and their Greek equivalents.

Humphreys, M. W.: On certain influences of accent in Latin iambic trimeters.

Trumbull, J. Hammond: On the Algonkin verb.

Haldeman, S. S.: On a supposed mutation between *l* and *u*.

Proceedings of the eighth annual session, New York, 1876.

1877. — Volume VIII.

Packard, L. R.: Notes on certain passages in the Phaedo and the Gorgias of Plato.

Toy, C. H.: On the nominal basis on the Hebrew verb.

Allen, F. D.: On a certain apparently pleonastic use of *ὅς*.

Whitney, W. D.: On the relation of surd and sonant.

Holden, E. S.: On the vocabularies of children under two years of age.

Goodwin, W. W.: On the text and interpretation of certain passages in the Agamemnon of Aeschylus.

Stickney, A.: On the single case-form in Italian.

Carter, F.: On Willmann's theory of the authorship of the Nibelungenlied.

Sihler, E. G.: On Herodotus's and Aeschylus's accounts of the battle of Salamis.

Whitney, W. D.: On the principle of economy as a phonetic force.

Carter, F.: On the Kurenberg hypothesis.

March, F. A.: On dissimilated gemination.

Proceedings of the ninth annual session, Baltimore, 1877.

1878. — Volume IX.

Gildersleeve, B. L.: Contributions to the history of the articular infinitive.

Toy, C. H.: The Yoruban language.

Humphreys, M. W.: Influence of accent in Latin dactylic hexameters.

Sachs, J.: Observations on Plato's Cratylus.

Seymour, T. D.: On the composition of the *Cynegeticus* of Xenophon.

Humphreys, M. W.: Elision, especially in Greek.

Proceedings of the tenth annual session, Saratoga, 1878.

1879. — Volume X.

Toy, C. H.: Modal development of the Semitic verb.

Humphreys, M. W.: On the nature of caesura.

Humphreys, M. W.: On certain effects of elision.

Cook, A. S.: Studies in Heliand.

Harkness, A.: On the development of the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.

D'Ooge, M. L.: The original recension of the *De Corona*.

Peck, T.: The authorship of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*.

Seymour, T. D.: On the date of the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus.

Proceedings of the eleventh annual session, Newport, 1879.

1880. — Volume XI.

Humphreys, M. W.: A contribution to infantile linguistic.

Toy, C. H.: The Hebrew verb-termination *un*.

Packard, L. R.: The beginning of a written literature in Greece.

Hall, I. H.: The declension of the definite article in the Cypriote inscriptions.

Sachs, J.: Observations on Lucian.

Sihler, E. G.: Virgil and Plato.

Allen, W. F.: The battle of Mons Graupius.

Whitney, W. D.: On inconsistency in views of language.

Edgren, A. H.: The kindred Germanic words of German and English, exhibited with reference to their consonant relations.

Proceedings of the twelfth annual session, Philadelphia, 1880.

1881. — Volume XII.

Whitney, W. D.: On Mixture in Language.

Toy, C. H.: The home of the primitive Semitic race.

March, F. A.: Report of the committee on the reform of English spelling.

Wells, B. W.: History of the *a*-vowel, from Old Germanic to Modern English.

Seymour, T. D.: The use of the aorist participle in Greek.

Sihler, E. G.: The use of abstract verbal nouns in *-σις* in Thucydides.

Proceedings of the thirteenth annual session, Cleveland, 1881.

1882. — Volume XIII.

Hall, I. H.: The Greek New Testament as published in America.

Merriam, A. C.: Alien intrusion between article and noun in Greek.

Peck, T.: Notes on Latin quantity.

Owen, W. B.: Influence of the Latin syntax in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels.

Wells, B. W.: The Ablaut in English.

Whitney, W. D.: General considerations on the Indo-European case-system.

Proceedings of the fourteenth annual session, Cambridge, 1882.

1883. — Volume XIV.

- Merriam, A. C. : The Caesareum and the worship of Augustus at Alexandria.
Whitney, W. D. : The varieties of predication.
Smith, C. F. : On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W. : The development of the Ablaut in Germanic.
Proceedings of the fifteenth annual session, Middletown, 1883.

1884. — Volume XV.

- Goodell, T. D. : On the use of the Genitive in Sophokles.
Tarbell, F. B. : Greek ideas as to the effect of burial on the future life of the soul.
Perrin, B. : The Crastinus episode at Palaepharsalus.
Peck, T. : Alliteration in Latin.
Von Jagemann, H. C. G. : Norman words in English.
Wells, B. W. : The Ablaut in High German.
Whitney, W. D. : Primary and Secondary Suffixes of Derivation and their exchanges.
Warren, M. : On Latin Glossaries. Codex Sangallensis, No. 912.
Proceedings of the sixteenth annual session, Hanover, 1884.

1885. — Volume XVI.

- Easton, M. W. : The genealogy of words.
Goodell, T. D. : Quantity in English verse.
Goodwin, W. W. : Value of the Attic talent in modern money.
Goodwin, W. W. : Relation of the *Πρόδρομοι* to the *Πρυτάνεις* in the Attic *Βουλή*.
Perrin, B. : Equestrianism in the Doloneia.
Richardson, R. B. : The appeal to sight in Greek tragedy.
Seymour, T. D. : The feminine caesura in Homer.
Sihler, E. G. : A study of Dinarchus.
Wells, B. W. : The vowels *e* and *i* in English.
Whitney, W. D. : The roots of the Sanskrit language.
Proceedings of the seventeenth annual session, New Haven, 1885.

1886. — Volume XVII.

- Tarbell, F. B. : Phonetic law.
Sachs, J. : Notes on Homeric Zoölogy.
Fowler, H. N. : The sources of Seneca de Beneficiis.
Smith, C. F. : On Southernisms.
Wells, B. W. : The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
Fairbanks, A. : The Dative case in Sophokles.
The Philological Society, of England, and The American Philological Association : Joint List of Amended Spellings.
Proceedings of the eighteenth annual session, Ithaca, 1886.

1887. — Volume XVIII.

- Allen, W. F.: The monetary crisis in Rome, A.D. 33.
 Sihler, E. G.: The tradition of Cæsar's Gallic Wars, from Cicero to Orosius.
 Clapp, E. B.: Conditional sentences in Aischylos.
 Pease, E. M.: On the relative value of the manuscripts of Terence.
 Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect.
 Wells, B. W.: The sounds *o* and *u* in English.
 Smyth, H. W.: The Arcado-Cyprian dialect. — *Addenda*.
 Proceedings of the nineteenth annual session, Burlington, 1887.

1888. — Volume XIX.

- Allen, W. F.: The *Lex Curiata de Imperio*.
 Goebel, J.: On the impersonal verbs.
 Bridge, J.: On the authorship of the Cynicus of Lucian.
 Whitney, J. E.: The "Continued Allegory" in the first book of the Fairy
 Queene.
 March, F. A.: Standard English: its pronunciation, how learned.
 Brewer, F. P.: Register of new words.
 Proceedings of the twentieth annual session, Amherst, 1888.

1889. — Volume XX.

- Smyth, H. W.: The vowel system of the Ionic dialect.
 Gudeman, A.: A new source in Plutarch's Life of Cicero.
 Gatschet, A. S.: Sex-denoting nouns in American languages.
 Cook, A. S.: Metrical observations on a Northumbrianized version of the Old
 English Judith.
 Cook, A. S.: Stressed vowels in Ælfric's Homilies.
 Proceedings of the twenty-first annual session, Easton, 1889.
 Index of authors, and index of subjects, Vols. I.-XX.

The Proceedings of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application until they are out of print.

Separate copies of articles printed in the Transactions are given to the authors for distribution.

The "Transactions *for*" any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the Transactions are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table: —

The Transactions for 1869 *and* 1870 form Volume I.

"	"	"	1871	form	Volume II.
"	"	"	1872	"	III.
"	"	"	1873	"	IV.
"	"	"	1874	"	V.
"	"	"	1875	"	VI.
"	"	"	1876	"	VII.

The Transactions for 1877 form Volume VIII.

"	"	"	1878	"	IX.
"	"	"	1879	"	X.
"	"	"	1880	"	XI.
"	"	"	1881	"	XII.
"	"	"	1882	"	XIII.
"	"	"	1883	"	XIV.
"	"	"	1884	"	XV.
"	"	"	1885	"	XVI.
"	"	"	1886	"	XVII.
"	"	"	1887	"	XVIII.
"	"	"	1888	"	XIX.
"	"	"	1889	"	XX.

The price of these volumes is \$2.00 apiece, except Volumes XV. and XX., for which \$2.50 are charged. The first two volumes will not be sold separately.

REDUCTION IN THE PRICE OF COMPLETE SETS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

Single COMPLETE SETS of the Transactions (Volumes I.-XX.) will be sold to public libraries, until further notice, at *thirty-five* dollars a set.

It is especially appropriate that *American* Libraries should exert themselves to procure this series while it may be had. It is the work of *American* scholars, and contains many valuable articles not elsewhere accessible; and, aside from these facts, as the first collection of essays in general philology made in this country, it is sure to be permanently valuable for the history of American scholarship.